

Liber cui Titulus, Two Dis-
courses against the Ro-
manists, &c. Authore
H. Dodwell,

IMPRIMATUR,

Geo. Hooper, R^{ma}. Dia-
Junui 8. *Archiepiscopo Cantuar.*
1676. *à Sacris Domest.*

Liber cui Titulus, Two Dis-
courses against the Ro-
manists, &c. Authore
H. Dodwell,

IMPRIMATUR,

Geo. Hooper, R^{ma}. Dia-
Junui 8. *Archiepiscopo Cantuar.*
1676. *à Sacris Domest.*

F.47 TWO SHORT 16.51
DISCOURSES

Against the
ROMANISTS.

1. An Account of the *Fundamental Principle of Popery*, and of the insufficiency of the *Proofs* which they have for it.
2. An Answer to Six *Queries* proposed to a *Gentlewoman* of the *Church of England*, by an *Emissary* of the *Church of Rome*.

By HENRY DODWELL M. A.
and sometimes Fellow of Trinity
Colledge near DUBLIN.

LONDON,

Printed for Benj. Tooke, and are to be sold
at the Ship in St. Paul's Church-yard.

1676.

L

829:03

A N
A C C O U N T
O F T H E
Fundamental Principle
O F
P O P E R Y,

As it is a
Distinct Communion ;

A N D
Of the insufficiency of the *Proofs*
which they have for it.
W I T H
A P R E F A C E concerning
the *Usefulness* of this Undertaking.

By HENRY DODWELL.


L O N D O N ,
Printed for Benjamin Tooke. 1676.

• 820:03

A
PREFACE

Concerning the
USEFULNESS

Of the following
HYPOTHESIS.

§. 1.  Though I cannot undertake for what is mine in the management of the following Discourse; yet as to the design (for which I am wholly beholden to the
A 4 Good-

A Preface.

Goodness of my Cause, and the *intrinsick* reasonableness of the Evidences which prove it good) I think I may, without Immodesty, affirm that, if it hold, it must be of universal use with them of the Roman Communion.

I. Use. §. 2. For 1. it must be of great use for the Laity and the Vulgar, who either have not the Abilities, or cannot spare the time, which would be requisite for Enquiring into the particular Disputes, to have the Controversies reduced into a narrow compass. And especially if these few things, to which they are reduced, may suffice for securing the Duty incumbent on such Persons as well as if the Enquiry had been more minute; and when withal the Evidence,

A Preface.

dence, on which their Resolution depends, is suited to the capacity of that sort of persons. Now all these things are provided for by the following Hypothesis.

§. 3. All the Disputes between us are reduced to this one of the Popes Supremacy over the Catholick Church dissuasive. *As for our Differences in Other Particulars, it is here proved, that, if we be not mistaken in This, themselves either cannot charge us with Error, or not with any Error of that consequence as may excuse them, either for Separating from our Communion, or for that rigorous Imposing their own Opinions which are contrary to it.*

§. 4. And this does indeed effectually.

A Preface.

festually secure the Duty of Ordinary Laicks in this whole affair. For the Obligation incumbent at least on such Persons who are not, by their particular Calling, obliged to Enquire, can only be to know so much as may secure their Christian Practice; and that is sufficiently secured by due adhering to that Communion where they may reasonably expect the performance of those Divine Promises which are conveyed in the use of the Sacraments, and the other Ordinary Means of Grace, so that the main concernment of such Persons is this, to know where such a Communion is to be had. Now the solving of this Question appears from the Principles here laid down, sufficient to decide the whole Dispute concerning the true Communion.

If

A Preface.

If it should prove true that the Pope has this Authority over the Catholick Church diffusive, it would follow that his particular Church must be the Catholick Church virtual, and so must have a Title to all those Promises made to the Catholick Church in the Scriptures (thus much at least will follow, even according to their Hypothesis who do not pretend that these Promises reach so high as Infallibility) and therefore that they were obliged to submit to Active Obedience, to all Lawful Impositions, and Passive even in Unlawful ones, so that in all Cases it wou'd be Unlawful to joyn with any other Communion in opposition to it. And on the other side, if it prove false, it will plainly follow that it is unlawful,
either

A Preface.

either for those who are already in that Communion to continue in it, seeing they cannot continue in it without being accessory to the Divisions of Christendom by abetting a Tyrannical Power over it; or for others to desert their own Communion to come to the Roman, which cannot on those Principles, be done with any such pretence of Necessity as may excuse their Separation from being Schismatical.

§. 5. The Evidence also into which this Dispute is ultimately resolved, must needs be such as must be suitable to the meanest capacity that is capable of acting prudently in this great affair (and certainly every one is in Interest, as well as Duty, obliged to make use of his utmost Prudence in a matter wherein his greatest Interests are so
nearly

A Preface.

*nearly concerned) For the meanest
Prudence that is, will require that
where they cannot choose their way,
there at least they should choose their
Guide. And it is only the Au-
thority of the Pope as a Princi-
ple of Unity, and of the Church
adhering to him as a Guide in Con-
troverties, of which this Hypothe-
sis allows them a Liberty to judge,
in order to their own private satis-
faction. And as the matter is such,
concerning which the meanest Pru-
dence, that can deserve the name of
Prudence, is obliged to judge, so the
Evidence is such as every one must
be capable of judging who is capable
of being Prudently and Rational-
ly a Christian. For the very Truth
of Christianity it self, in refer-
ence to us in this Age, must be
proved by Historical Testimonies
of*

A Preface.

Of the Miracles by which it was attested from the beginning; and the Canon of the Scripture must be proved by the Testimonies of those by whom the Scriptures were delivered. And it is the same Historical Testimony, whether of express Scripture, or of express Tradition, to which they are here referred for the proof of this Supremacy of the Pope: and the Subject concerning which this Testimony was to be given, could not but have had so general an influence on their Practice (if they had acknowledged any dependence on this Supremacy) as that it must have been as notorious to them who gave it, as those Miracles, or that Canon; and therefore their Testimony must have been as Credible in one Case as in the other.

A Preface.

§. 6. *Besides that the Negative Argument (which I here make use of) is much less Questionable than the Affirmative. That is, there is much more reason to doubt of a pretended Tradition, if it be not expressly mentioned in the Primitive Authors, (and doubting is sufficient for my purpose, to overthrow the Credit of that which pretends to be an Article of Faith) than to believe a thing to have descended from the Apostles, because those Authors pretend it did so. For in their Affirmations they many times deliver what they think on their own Conjectural Reasonings, wherein they are as Fallible as others. But what they have not mentioned, if it be not allowed to conclude that they knew*
ic

A Preface.

it not, and that therefore there was then no Historical Evidence for it, seeing that could not have escaped their knowledge; yet thus much at least will follow that we cannot be satisfied that they had any such Evidence, which is enough to render it doubtful to us whether it were an Apostolical Tradition. Now that they did not mention this Supremacy, I do not desire the Ignorant to take the bare word of our Authors; but I am content that they trust their own Judgments concerning the passages produced, as far as they are capable of judging them; or where they find themselves unable, that there they acquiesce in the Confessions of candid, learned Men, though of our Adversaries Communion. Which is no more than what they
them.

A Preface.

themselves count Prudent in the like Cases, when they occur in the management of their secular affairs.

§. 7. Nor is it only thus II. Use.
Convenient, but it is almost
Necessary, in dealing with our Ad-
versaries, to begin, at least, with
this Fundamental Principle. For
till they be convinced of the Falli-
bility of their Guide, all the Rea-
sons produced against them are only
taken for Temptations and tryals
of the steadfastness of their Implicite
Faith. And, in affairs of this na-
ture, they are taught to distrust
their own Judgment (nay, in
matters of Faith the most Learn-
ed Clergy are taught to do so, as
they are considered in their private
capacity, as well as the more igno-
rant Laity) and they are further
taught

A Preface.

taught that, in such matters, their Faith is by so much the more excellent and meritorious, by how much more it captivates their Understandings; and that this captivating of their Understandings implies a denial of their own Judgments when different from that of their Superiors. Now upon these terms it is impossible to deal with them by particular Reasonings. For the utmost that can be expected from the clearest Reasonings, is, that their private Judgments may be convinced by them. But if, when this is done, they distrust their own Judgments, nay, think themselves obliged to deny their own Judgments in compliance with that of their Superiors, nay, take it to be the greater glory of their Faith

A Preface.

to deny the greater and more powerful Convictions; it will then follow that, by how much more Conscientiously they Act according to their own Principles, by so much the less capable they must be of this kind of Reasoning. It must needs be in vain to urge them with such Reasons, by which they will not be tryed, though they should indeed prove convictive, and that to their own Understandings.

§. 8. Nor indeed is it rational to expect that they should be otherwise disposed, pursuant to their Principles. For all Prudent Considerers of things will confess, that one direct proof that a thing is actually True, is more considerable than many Probabilities

A Preface.

ties to the contrary. Especially if the direct proof be of it self stronger than any contrary Objection; as indeed no Objection can be so sufficient to prove any Proposition false, as the Infallibility of the Proponent is to prove it true. Which must the rather hold, considering that they take the judgment of their Judge of Controversies for an adequately-infallible Proof; never remembring that, though indeed the Spirit of God be Infallible, yet, the Arguments whereby they prove their Judge of Controversies so assisted by that Spirit as to partake of its Infallibility, that is, so assisted, as that their Judge of Controversies shall Infallibly follow the Infallible Guidance of the Spirit (otherwise themselves cannot pretend that all assistance of the Spirit must infer

A Preface.

fer Infallibility, unless they will grant that every good Christian is Infallible, because they cannot deny that he is so assisted) I say, these Arguments are only Moral, and such as may, in many Cases, be exceeded by Arguments taken from the nature of the thing; and that the Consequence must follow the weaker part; so that still their Faith can be no more than morally certain, though their Judge of Controversies were granted to be Infallible in regard of his assistance.

§. 9. Yet even so, it should be remembered on our part, that no Arguments were fit to be admitted against the sense of an infallible Judge, but such as might exceed those whereby their Judge of Controversies seems to them to be proved Infallible; which would cut off many of those Arguments which

A Preface.

which are used in the particular Disputes. But beginning at the First Principle, it is easie to shew that they are obliged to take our Arguments into serious consideration, and to determine according as they judge Reasonable in their private Judgments. For the Judge of Controversies cannot in reason, oblige them to captivate their Understandings to it self till it be proved. And the Arguments here used are Antecedent to that Proof. And when upon examination of the Credentials of the Judge of Controversies, the proof of such a Judge shall be found insufficient, they will then, and not till then, have reason to trust their private Judgments in the particular Disputes. And then, and only then, the particular

A Preface.

particular Disputes may be likely to obtain an equal hearing from such of them as are truly Conscientious.

§. 10. Besides, if this Hypothesis hold true, it III. use. will be very useful both to retain several in the Reformed Communion, and to bring several others over from the Roman, who are already by their Principles disposed for the Reformation.

1. There may be several, who, in the particular Disputes, may probably incline to the Roman side, and yet have an abhorrence for the Roman rigour in those principal ones concerning Infallibility, and the Popes Supremacy. These, if they may be perswaded that they may be admitted to that Communion

A Preface.

nion without professing the Belief of those Principles to which we are as yet to suppose them so very averse, may be tempted to think it lawful to joyn themselves in Communion with them. This seems plainly to have been Mr. Cressy's Case, whose entrance into that Commu-

From. (Second Edition) Sect. 1. Ch. 19. §. 4. p. 74. Sect. 2. Ch. 21. §. 3. p. 188. Append. Ch. 5. §. 2. p. 515. See *Veron's* Lat. Answ. to Q. Gener. 8. p. 551. at the end of the *Exon*.

nion was very much facilitated by the account of Infallibility given him by Dr. Veron, whereby he was persuaded that it was

only a School-term, not used in the Decrees of any received Councils, no nor any way expressly defined, and that the use of it would not be exacted from him by their Church

as

A Preface.

as a Condition of her Communion. For he acknowledges he had formerly believed that this main ground of the Roman Religion (so he calls it) namely the Infallibility of that Church was as demonstratively confutable as any absurdity in Mathematicks. And particularly he confesses that Exom. Sect. 1. Chap. 15. §. 3. p. 53.
Mr. Chillingworth's Arguments against it Sect. 2. Ch. 21. §. 4. p. 190. Sect. 2. Ch. 3. p. 90.
had to him appeared unanswerable; and that his Book alone had the principal influence on him to shut up his entrance into Catholick Unity. But it is here proved that whatsoever may be thought of the Word (concerning which more may be said than was observed by Mr. Cressy's
B Friends,

A Preface.

Friends, but that it is unnecessary to say it on this occasion) yet the Thing must necessarily be maintained by them on the same Principles by which they have presumed to censure the Reformation, and in that very sense wherein our Arguments are so conclusive against it. It is very strange to me, and seems disagreeable, I will not say to that Candor, but that accurateness, which was observed by him in that Enquiry, that he could pretend that it was the Word Infallibility against which Mr. Chillingworth's Arguments had been so successful, or that he could satisfy himself with that pretence in a matter of that importance. Indeed, if his Arguments had been Grammatical, there might have been some colour for pre-

A Preface:

pretending that advantage was taken from the ambiguity of the Word to pick out the most Invidious sense among those many other more favourable ones of which it was capable; but being Notional and taken from the nature of the Thing, they must necessarily be levelled against it in some certain signification. And it had been easie to have shewn that they do as clearly overthrow the Infallibility of Judgment in a Creature in the use of Fallible Means (which is the sense which I have here proved the Romanists obliged to maintain) though their Infalibility were derived from the Divine assistance; as if it were derived from their own Nature, as that of God is, which is the sense which Mr. Cressy would make to

A Preface.

he only concerned in these Arguments it might easily have been also shewn that Mr. Cressly himself grants the very sense of the word here defined, and cannot deny but that it is very properly and naturally signified by it; nay that, by his own Principles, the Churches not using it in her Canons can be no Argument that she ever intended to leave private Persons at their liberty to use it, or forbear it, as they pleased. Whence it were easie further to infer, not only that it must needs be intolerable for private persons to deny it, but also that it must be justly Suspicious as much as to wave it (since it has been used,) though on pretence of another sense applicable to it, but never intended by them who brought it into the Roman Church, though at first they might have

A Preface.

have forbore the introducing of it. And if it be not free to Subjects, either to deny or forbear it, what room can be left for their Indulgence so much celebrated in this particular? Nay, what Indulgence could it be, if they might indeed be excused from the Word, as long as they are obliged to maintain the Thing; I say obliged, by doing that which cannot possibly be defended without supposing it? Certainly they cannot think but that Actions are as significative as Words in reference to God and their own Consciences.

§. 11. So also for the other point concerning the Popes Supremacy, it is an usual Artifice whereby many others are seduced, that they are perswaded that they may take the same Liberty that the French

A Preface.

take, in Questioning the Popes Monarchical Power. But, from the Principles here laid down, it plainly appears that the Liberty taken by them is rather connived at by the Roman Court on politick Considerations, than approved or allowed by the Roman Communion, as consistent with their Principles. The like might have been shewn concerning several other Consequential Doctrines which facilitate the seducing of Profelytes; as that of the Distinction between the Church and Court of Rome, and the possibility of Reforming the Abuses of the Court by the Power of the Church, &c.

A Preface.

§. 12. Now in Persons who have not been inured to those Prejudices of Education, and that great Credulity which are insensibly infused into Persons bred in that Communion (which must be supposed to be the Case of them who are not as yet Profelyted to it) these general Principles of Infallibility and the Popes Supremacy are like to meet with the most difficult reception. For to such who have had experience of the difficulty of things by their own tryal of them, and who are not averse to any pains that may appear requisite for the satisfaction of their Consciences; it is so far from being likely to appear that it is an Act of Christian Vertue to avoid Evidence, or to suppress
B 4 their

A Preface.

their Convictions, when different from the Sense of those few interested Persons who are plainly possessed of the Government of that whole Communion, as that (till their Infallibility be first proved) it is not likely to pass for an Act of common honesty. Nay, their expecting such unreasonable Concessions from them at first, would, to such Persons, be a very just reason of suspecting them, when they should find themselves treated by them at the same rate as they might expect to be by the most professed Deceivers. For what more likely Art could any Deceiver use, than to persuade those, whom he had a mind to seduce, to trust in him without and against their own Convictions? Nor is it likely that they who have no other inducement than

A Preface.

than the intrinsick reasonableness of its proof should be perswaded to believe it as easily as they who have been inured to it by Prejudices of their Education. Nor is there that violence offered to their Faculties in following a weak and doubtful Proof in one particular instance, as in renouncing their clearest Convictions Universally, in all matters to be decided by their Judge of Controversies. And therefore it is very possible for Persons favourable to the sense of the Romanists in many of the particular Disputes, still to be very averse to their pretences to Infallibility; and this not (as it is usually said by our Adversaries) only out of a haughtiness and unwillingness to yield, but on rational and truly-Conscientious accounts.

A Preface;

§. 13. *Nor is the other Doctrine concerning the Monarchical Power of the Pope less unacceptable to Persons of another Communion before they are brought over to the Roman. I will not mention how much the consequence of believing such a Doctrine may impose upon their Liberty, because that will not by our Adversaries be thought a Conscientious Disqualitative from it. Though certainly it be very allowable to stand upon their own Rights, till they be convinced out of them by a greater Evidence than would suffice for Concessions of less importance; which is sufficient for my present design. That which I had rather insist on at present, is, the indefensibleness of the abuses of the*
Court

A Preface.

Court of Rome, which are so gross and provoking, as that generally they are the last things to which Revolters are reconciled; and usually, when they are so, it is only on pretence that that Church is not concerned for them. But, by this Monarchical Power of the Pope, the power of Reforming them is ascribed Only to him whose Interest it is they never be Reformed; and so to destroy all hopes of Reformation. Which is a consideration that, if seriously thought of, would certainly startle many of those who are brought over to them on accounts truly Conscientious, being seduced to it by such false pretences.

A Preface.

§. 14. For when it shall appear to this sort of Persons (as I have endeavoured to make it appear by the following Hypothesis) that their joyning in that Communion must necessarily imply their approbation of these Unacceptable Doctrines, they must find themselves unavoidably reduced to this choice, whether they will embrace these Doctrines rather than forbear their Communion, or whether they will keep off from their Communion rather than own these Schismatical Doctrines. Nor will it be hard to judge how they would be likely to determine in such a Case. For if their aversion to these Doctrines be greater than their kindness to particular Opinions or Practices of the Roman Communion (as I have already shewn that it is reasonable
to

A Preface.

to believe that it is frequently the Case of Persons not yet Profelyted by them) they must necessarily think themselves obliged on these terms to continue where they are.

Q. 15. 2. *And the same things proportionably applyed may serve to shew the usefulness of this Hypothesis for gaining several moderate Persons of the Romanists themselves. They who call the Doctrine of the Popes Infalibility* White's Tab. Suffrag. *Archi-Heretical, and confess themselves unable, in this Principle, to defend their Church against us, when they shall find that the Fundamental Principle of their own, as a distinct, Communion, is this confessedly indefensible Archi-Heretical Doctrine & that without this they cannot justify*

A Preface.

rise either their Separation or their Impositions, they cannot think it safe in Conscience to continue any longer divided from us.

§. 16. *The same thing is also applicable to that other Doctrine which prevails with several very considerable Parties of the Roman Communion, That the Supreme Judge of Controversies on Earth is either the diffusive Catholick Church, or a Council that is truly Free and General, and accordingly received as such by the Catholick Church diffusive, and that that alone is the seat of Infallibility. They who are of this Judgment, if the following Hypothesis hold true, must necessarily be obliged to change*

A Preface.

change *their* Communion on two accounts.

1. *That they cannot make out their own Title to their being the Catholick Church in this sense, nor can they consequently prove that many of our Doctrines, which they condemn as Heretical, have ever been Canonically condemned by this Judge of Controversies. This will hinder them from abstaining from our Communion for them.*

And 2. that, on these Principles, the Doctrines of the Popes Monarchy and Infallibility must be Heretical. This will oblige them to abstain from the Communion of those who maintain them.

A Preface.

¶ 17. 1. *They cannot make out their Title to their own being the Catholick Church in this sense. For evidently they are not the Catholick Church diffusive, many considerable parts whereof are not in Communion with them. And therefore all the Plea they can make to the Authority or Infallibility of the Catholick Church must be grounded on the Notion of a Catholick Church Virtual, which Notion they must needs disclaim in asserting the Power of the diffusive Catholick or its Lawful Representative over all particular Churches. These things I conceive so clear from the Doctrine here delivered, as that I cannot think my self obliged to say any more concerning them at present. Hence it will follow, that all those particular Doctrines, which*
have

A Preface.

have been defined against us only by the Western Councils, without the Suffrages of the Eastern

As the Florentine Council, &c.

Bishops, or the reception even of all the Western Churches themselves, must fail of that pretence to Infallibility which is here even from their own Principles proved necessary to justify their Separation from us on that account. And when these are deduced, there will remain but few instances of Doctrines disputed between us, if any, which themselves can pretend to have been defined by the united Suffrages of all Eastern and Western Bishops, and unanimously received in the particular Dioceses. Nor can they, on these terms, give any account why they condemn and exclude from their interest in the com-

A Preface.

mon Judicatory of Christendom
as many, and as great, and every
way as considerable, Churches as
themselves.

As of Con-
sensus, &c.

§. 18. 2. But if such
Western Councils, *as*
are in this point defen-
ded by our Adversaries of this Fa-
ction, must indeed be admitted for
the Supreme visible Judicatories,
and consequently as intitled to that
Infallibility which is by them as-
cribed to this Supreme Judicato-
ry; I cannot conceive how they
can avoid thinking themselves ob-
liged in Conscience to separate from
the Communion of them who ascribe
this Infallibility to the Pope and
his Conclave. For there is no-
thing that can be said to justify
their Separation from us, but will
as

A Preface.

as strongly prove them obliged to separate from their own Brethren of that Perswasion. For these Councils have taken upon them to decide the Controversie concerning the Supremacy, by declaring this Power to be in the Church diffusive, and themselves to be Lawful Representatives of that Church; and consequently that all Ecclesiastical Power, the Papacy itself being also expressly mentioned, was subject to them. For can they think that Propositions, neither Necessary, as to their matter, nor Evident, as to their Proof, can oblige Subjects to their Belief under pain of incurring the Censure of Heresy, only on account of their being defined by their Supreme Judge of Controversies? And is there any thing that themselves

A Preface.

selves can pretend to have been more expressly defined by that Judge, than this is? If they will think to evade this Argument, by pretending that this Doctrine of the Power of their Judge of Controversies is not so properly de fide it self, as a Principle antecedent to the belief of all Particulars that are so; yet this can derogate nothing from their obligation to separate from the Communion of Dissenters concerning it. For can they think themselves obliged to Separate for the denial of one particular defined by that Authority? And is there not incomparably more reason they should do so for the denial of the Authority it self? Is not the Authority it self more Fundamental than the particulars can be which, on these Principles, derive their

A Preface.

their whole Credibility from it? And must it not be much more heinous to destroy the Credit of all possible Particulars, which, on these Principles, is included in the Judge of Controversies, than to refuse an actual Assent to any one Particular? And as it hence appears, that the matter of these Differences among themselves is more momentous, and more obliging to a Separation, than themselves can pretend those to be wherein they differ from us; so I may add farther, that the Separation, which ought in Conscience to follow hereupon, must be equally irreconcilable. For will it not come to the same Event, whether we utterly disown a visible Judge of Controversies, or whether we indeed own one, but own such a one

A Preface.

*as that our Adversaries cannot think themselves obliged to stand to his decision? In both Cases there is equally acknowledged a Liberty of Appeal from all Power that is acknowledged by the Adversary. And that Power which must decide Controversies against an Adversary who does not think himself obliged (as much as in Conscience) to submit to such a Decision, must do it either by force or Arbitration, which are Remedies as allowable by our Principles, as by those of our Adversaries. Nay, in this Case they cannot plead even that pretence of Canonical Punctuality, at least so long to forbear separating from the Communion even of acknowledged Hereticks, till their Cause were declared to be Heresy by
their*

A Preface.

their competent Judge. For they who believe these Councils to have been the Supreme Judicatories, must consequently conceive themselves obliged to believe that their Superiority over the Pope has been defined by a Canonical Authority; and they who do so, can have nothing left to excuse them for forbearing an actual Separation. And as it thus appears that they must hold themselves obliged to abstain from the Communion of those Persons who professedly and expressly own this Doctrine of the Popes Monarchy: So when they shall find that this Monarchy is indeed the Fundamental Principle of the whole Roman Communion, as distinct from others; they must, by the same Principles, think themselves obliged

A Preface.

obliged to abstain from the Communion of that whole Church, not only of those who do exprelly defend that Monarchy, but also of others, though in terms denying it, as long as they keep to that Communion which cannot be kept without consequentially defending it. It is in vain to think to weaken the Authority of the Decision of those Councils, because it was in a matter concerning their own Interest. For besides that this will give Us a plain advantage against any Authority whereby they can pretend that we are Canonically censured; They themselves are sensible, on other occasions, that this is inseparably the Right of the Supreme Judicatory, to Judge even in matters of its own Interest; seeing there lies
no

A Preface.

no Appeal from it, even in such Cases, to any other Judicatory that might Judge more impartially concerning them. And they who think the Supreme Judicatory Infallible, must think themselves also obliged, not only to a Canonical Acquiescence for Peace's sake, but also to an Internal Assent and Approbation of the Justice of such a Decree, even out of Conscience. This I conceive at least sufficient to prove, in this Case of persons not proselyted, as well as in the former of persons already of that Communion, that they who do more firmly adhere to this Doctrine of the Superiority of the Catholick Church diffusive, must think themselves obliged to separate from their communion when they are convinced of the inconsistency of this Doctrine with it. The only difference is that

G

this

A Preface.

this firmer adherence to this Doctrine may more ordinarily and easily be expected from Persons not yet Profelyted, than from those who are prejudiced in favour of the contrary by their Education in that Communion. These are those Dividing Principles intimated in the following Answer to Q. 4. Answer to the Queries proposed to the Gentlewoman, though I was unwilling on that occasion to enlarge further concerning them.

IV. Use. 9. 19. *A fourth Use of this Hypothesis is for the direction of Peacemakers, to let them see what it is that renders our reconciliation impossible; and which, if it be not first accommodated, must render all their endeavours in*
par-

A Preface.

particular Questions unsuccessful ; and therefore against which they ought more earnestly to strive by how much they are more zealous for Catholick Peace. The way hitherto attempted has been to endeavour to reconcile our particular differences. This has been, either by clearing their respective Churches from all those things for which they have not expressly declared, and of which express Professions are not exacted from Persons to be reconciled unto them, by how great Authority soever of their particular Communicants they have been countenanced or maintained. This way has been taken on their side by Mr. Veron, &c. and on ours by Bishop Montague. Or where the Churches have declared themselves, there

A Preface.

*by allowing the greatest Latitude of Exposition, and putting the most favourable Sense on their Decrees of which they are capable. Thus Grotius has dealt with the Council of Trent, and S. Clara with our English Articles. The design of all the endeavours of this kind has been to reconcile the Churches without any yielding on either side. I confess I think the number of Controversies may be exceedingly diminished by this way of proceeding, which must needs be very acceptable to any, who is more a Lover of the Catholick Church's Peace than of Disputation. Many of the Tenets on both sides, that are very invidiously represented by Adversaries, will, on a closer examination, appear to be either mistakes
of*

A Preface.

of the Writers meanings, or Opinions of particular Writers, or senses of the Church's Decrees which were never designed by the Church that made them; and consequently unnecessary to be assented to in order to a reconciliation. But when all is done, they will fall very short of reconciling the different Communions. For though all their particular Decrees, even concerning Faith, were made tolerable by these means, (1) yet that were not sufficient to prove their Communion Lawful; and (2) yet there can be no hopes of reconciling all particular Decrees by these means, but some will still remain which will make their Communion intolerable to them of the other side.

A Preface,

§. 20. 1. Though all their particular Decrees of Faith might, by these means, be made tolerable; yet that were not sufficient to prove their Communion lawful. *For neither is there any security that that sense of their Decrees, which might be taken for tolerable, would in Practice prove such as would be admitted by Governours; so as that they on the other side might, on their owning of that sense, be received to their Communion. No, though it were countenanced by Doctors of never so eminent note, nay, by the Ecclesiasticks who should receive them. For still their Church ought to be admitted to be the most Authentick Expoliter of her own meaning.*

And

A Preface.

And I do not doubt but several of their Profelytes, who should go over to them on account of many of these moderate Explications, would find themselves mistaken in many things as soon as their Church had any obligation to explain her self concerning them. And though the Church might not think it worth her interposition to do it upon the reconciliation of every particular Profelyte, yet She must certainly think her self obliged to it in order to the reconciliation of the whole Communions. Then many of these palliations would certainly be found so repugnant to her design. and so destitute of any plausible appearance, as though She had been willing to yield in earnest in instances wherein She might not seem to do so (and that is the ut-

A Preface.

most condescension that can in reason be expected from a Church which pretends to be Infallible, at least while She pretends to be so) yet they would not afford them even so, as much as a Salvo for their reputation. Nay, though all her present Decrees of Faith had appeared tolerable, and appeared so in that very sense wherein She really understood them; yet even this would not suffice for a solid reconciliation of Communion, as long as the same Authority, by which these other Decrees had been defined, is still owned to be Infallible. For still the next General Council (in the sense wherein they give that Title to such as are not truly Occidental) may define new Articles never yet defined, or at least declare such Propositions to be so, which, as
yet

A Preface.

yet while they are not defined, may
very innocently be disbelieved.
And then, as they, who even now be-
lieve what has been defined hither-
to, not for the intrinsic Probabi-
lity of the things defined; but for
the Authority whereby they are de-
fined, must find themselves obliged,
by the same Principles, to receive
such new Definitions of the same
Authority; So we, who even now
disbelieve them, on account of the
unsatisfactoriness of their intrinsic
Proofs, and for the contrary Proofs
produced against them; and who do
not believe the Authority of their
Proponent a sufficient Argument
to countervail these intrinsic con-
futations, must still continue to dis-
believe them, even when they shall
be so defined; which will then ob-
lige us again to divide as great a

A Preface.

distance as ever. Nor is this to be looked on as a Case unlikely to happen, considering that there are already many very suspicious Doctrines so universall^y received, as that their Learned men confidently tell us that some of them are *serè de side*, and doubt of others whether they be not already altogether so. Where it is observable that the grounds of their judging so, are, either the expressness of those Decrees of their Church which are already made concerning them, or the Universality of their reception, or the stress which is laid upon them, which, in all likelihood, would prevail with such a General Council, if it had been assembled, to give their Suffrages for them.

§. 21. 2. But though a reconcilia-
tion:

A Preface:

tion of the Particulars hitherto defined might have been more available for a solid Peace, than it hence appears likely that it would be, yet even this is not Practicable by all the means of Reconciliation that have as yet been thought of. Some things have been defined in both Communions with such a design upon Dissenters, as that no mollifying Arts of Interpretation can prevail with any unprejudiced Person to believe that the Senses really intended by them are reconcileable. Nor indeed have the Romanists any reason to expect that we should agree with them in all the Particulars defined by them, whilst we do not agree with them in acknowledging the Credibility of their Judge of Controversies. For, Antecedent
ly

A Preface.

ly to their being defined, they confess many of them so obscure as that they may pardonably be disbelieved and opposed. And how can any wise man expect that all Men should be of one mind in so many instances of such a nature? And yet even one unlawful Condition of Communion is alone sufficient to make their Communion unlawful, and the Churches irreconcilable.

§ 22. Now that there are some things for which their Church herself is unavoidably concerned wherein we have all the reason, that can be desired, to expect that She should yield to us in order to the accommodation of our differences, I think I might confidently Appeal to as many Learned Men, though

A Preface.

though of our Adversaries Communion, as have had as well the Courage to speak their thoughts, as the Candor to follow their own Convictions. The Testimonies of many of them, to this purpose, are already so well known, as that I believe it will not be expected that I should exceed my present designed brevity by producing them. This therefore being supposed, it will plainly follow that no solid Peace can be expected with those of that Communion without some Concessions on their side; and therefore that which inevitably hardens them against all Concessions must consequently ruin all hopes of a lasting Reconciliation. Now this is done by their Doctrine of Infallibility, and their own Taste to it.

This

A Preface.

This is it that makes them presume to define such things as themselves confess to be inevident Antecedently to their own defining them. This makes it impossible for them (as long as they pretend to it) to submit those things as much as to a review, in this Age of Knowledge, which were at first defined in Ages of very great Ignorance. This hinders them from yielding to the clearest Convictions to the contrary, or from acknowledging them even where they cannot chuse but yield to them. This keeps them from reforming any of those Errors, of which we have reason to believe themselves so sensible (since the great modern improvements of Ecclesiastical Learning) as that they would not have introduced them, if they had
not

A Preface.

not found them already admitted, and thought themselves obliged not to desert them, nor to believe any Evidence sufficient to prove them blame-worthy, when they had once found them so admitted. And therefore it will concern all hearty well-wishers to Catholick Peace, to lay out their Zeal and Industry principally to discredit this one Doctrine which is so extremely pernicious to it.

§. 23. And in order hereunto I have endeavoured to make it appear, that the challenge of Infallibility to their whole Communion is truly grounded on a Principle disclaimed by considerable numbers of their Communicants; that is, the Popes absolute and unaccountable Monarchy over the Catholick

A Preface.

lick Church. Whence it will follow, that, though Infallibility did indeed belong to the Supreme Representative of the Catholick Church diffusive, yet they can lay no claim to it who deny his Papal Monarchy. And therefore they who believe these Promises of Infallibility to have been originally made only to the Catholick Church diffusive, and without deny this absolute Monarchy of the Pope, cannot lay any better claim to this Infallibility than any other part of the Catholick Church diffusive that is as great and as considerable as themselves. But themselves confess Churches no less ample for extent (and indeed more considerable for the multitude of Apostolical Sees) than their own, to be so far
from

A Preface.

from being Infalible, as that they believe them actually mistaken, even in matters of Faith, and that for several Centuries together before the Reformation. And therefore all the Authority which they can challenge on these Principles is only a Canonical one, such as is due to particular Provincial or National or Patriarchal districts, which are, on all sides, acknowledged to be Fallible. Which will not only concern the Council of Trent, but also all other Councils that are only Occidental.

§. 24. *Now this Concession alone, that they are Fallible, would, at least, be sufficient to shew that they could not think it unlawful to review their own Decrees, and either to correct or repeal them, as they should*

A Preface.

Should Judge it reasonable upon that review. And though indeed it is not for the Interest of the Publick that Governours should be too easie in rescinding their own Acts, and especially at the motion of such as challenge it as a Duty from them to rescind them, and when it cannot be done without an acknowledgment of their having been formerly mistaken; yet it is withal as little for that Interest, that they should wholly devest themselves of the Power of actually Practising it, when it shall appear necessary by the exigences of the Communities for which they are intrusted. And, if, in any Case, this may be allowed to be Expedient, there can be no reason to doubt but that it is so here. The thing is of
that

A Preface.

that importance, as that upon it depends the Reconciliation of the Divided Parties of Christendome, which are neither likely to be subdued by the Power of any one, nor possible to be reconciled without Concessions on some, if not on all, sides, by Churches, as well as by private Persons, and it cannot appear on which side the Concession is fit to be made, unless all submit to a tryal, and resolve, upon tryal, to yield to what they shall judge reasonable. Besides, there is a particular Reason why the Church should reserve an open Ear for all things that can be urged for her information in matters of Faith. Not only in regard that the things are such as do not derive their Lawfulness or Unlawfulness from her Authority,
bnt

A Preface.

but are what they are, either True or False, Antecedently to it; so that her Authority, as it cannot change the Nature of the things in themselves, so neither can it alter their obligation in reference to the Consciences of those who are otherwise perswaded: Nor that She must be Responsible to God, how little soever She be so to her Subjects, if She betray her trust in the Faith once delivered to her; and thereupon drive out of her Communion Persons, who ought to have been encouraged to continue it, and break off from the Communion of other Churches with whom She ought to have maintained a correspondence: But also because her whole Authority depends on it. For if She be Erroneous in Fundamentals, especially if her Error
be

A Preface.

be by way of Defect in them, She is incapable of being a Christian Church, and consequently incapable of Ecclesiastical Authority. So that, as She tenders her whole Authority in other things, She is obliged to use all diligence to secure her self from Error in these, and it must be her best Policy to do so. Nay, the greatest Human Authorities that are, and who are most Critical in insisting on these Punctualities of Policy in maintaining what they have once determined; yet think it no disparagement to them to condescend to a review, and to change their Judgments, upon better Information. And since the retriving of that sort of Learning, which is requisite for clearing Apostolical Tradition, which
came

A Preface.

came in with the Reformation of Religion, the Church of Rome her self is much better informed, and better qualified for Judging, than She was in those obscurer Ages wherein She first defined them.

§. 25. *Supposing therefore that She were thus disposed to come to a review, it plainly follows further, that the whole force of her new Decrees upon this review, must be resolved into the merit of the Cause. For when her Judgment has once been acknowledged Fallible, there can then remain no further pretence of any greater Certainty in her Conclusions, than in the Premises from whence they were deduced by her. And from hence it would be very reasonable*

A Preface.

sinable to expect 1. that She would not upon this new review define what She should believe insufficiently proved Antecedently to her Definition. This being applied to particulars, would cut off very many of her newly introduced Articles which her most eminent Champions confess inevident Antecedently to her defining them. And we might expect the number of Articles, which would be reduced upon this way of Tryal, the more considerable, if 2. all those counterfeit Miracles and Revelations, and all those counterfeit Authors and Authorities were waved, which at the defining of these Articles were generally believed genuine, but are since as generally acknowledged to have been Forgeries. All those Doctrines which,
upon

A Preface.

upon such Testimonies as these, were taken for Apostolical, must lose their Credit of being so as soon as these Testimonies shall be convicted of incompetency for assuring us what was Apostolical. Especially 3. if none but the earliest Writers be trusted, as indeed none else are competent, for conveying Apostolical Tradition to us. And 4. if they were wary in this kind to impose no Doctrines as Conditions of their Communion, but such as might appear even to themselves very Necessary and very Evident: If the defalcations were made which we have reason to believe would be made, even by themselves, upon the Suppositions now mentioned, I do not see any reason to despair of so much Liberty to be allowed by them as would suffice to recon-

A Preface.

reconcile our Communions. And this I believe will be an information very useful, and very acceptable to all hearty desires of the Peace of Christendom, that is indeed, to all truly-Christian Spirits.

§. 26. *A fifth Use of this v. use.*
Hypothesis is, that it will serve for a Scheme of Principles to justify the Reformation, for which some of our modern Adversaries have been so very importunate. Nor do I pretend hereby to supersede the Endeavours of that admirable Person Dr. Stillington. who has already undertaken them. His Principles do excellently well shew that, as to the Resolution of our Faith in those Particulars which are truly of an Apostolical Original, and wherein

D

we

A Preface.

we do agree with the Romanists themselves, we can sufficiently prove them derived from the Apostles by competent Testimonies of the several Ages through which they must have passed, without being any ways beholden to an Infallible Judge of Controversies. Nay that such an Infallible Judge is indeed a Means improper for such an End; as requiring many such things for its proof, to us, who must be supposed to live at a distance from the time of its Original Institution, as are every way, at least, as liable to Dispute as the Controversies to be determined by it. So that hence it appears that we may be Christians, nay and Catholics too, that is, that we may believe as many Articles as at first were imposed as necessary to be believed, without the least obligation
of

A Preface.

of being Romanists, that is, of believing all their superinduced Novel Doctrines. And this is of excellent use against them in the whole Dispute concerning the Resolution of Faith, where they pretend that the Books of the Scriptures themselves, and the Sense of those Books, and consequently all the Articles which are proved from those Senses, cannot be proved Credible to Us without the Authority of their Judge of Controversies; and therefore that as we follow this Authority in these things, so we ought to follow it in all other things equally recommended by it, which must therefore be equally Credible with them. This Consequence will indeed hold with them concerning whom the Supposition is true; and therefore it cannot be strange that

A Preface.

the Romanists, who profess to believe our common Articles on the Credit of this Authority, should look on those whom they call Hereticks as choosers in Religion, and as self condemned, in refusing to believe other things as credible, and credible on the same Principles with those they do believe, they still supposing that they, whom they call Hereticks, believe the common Articles on the same Principles on which themselves believe them. But from the Principles of that excellent Person it plainly appears, that the Supposition is not true concerning Us, and that as we profess we do not, so there is nothing that can in Reason oblige us to believe even our common Articles on the Authority of their, or any other pretended Infallible Judge of Controversies.

A Preface.

§.27. *But the Principles here advanced do not so much concern the Articles wherein we are agreed, as those wherein we differ, and therefore will more immediately reach the Popish Communion as Popish, and the Protestant as properly so called, that is, as protesting against their Errors, and against the Uncanonical courses taken by them for Imposing their Errors; and for the suppressing of all opposition to the contrary. Here it is first provided that, it being our part only to Assert our own Liberty from their Additional Articles, they are obliged to prove, not we to disprove, their Impositions. Then, because the first Principles of their Impositions are not agreed on by themselves, but expressly denied by several Persons in their Communion, therefore I*

A Preface.

*have proceeded to enquire after
them, by knowing what it is that
they are obliged by necessary conse-
quence to maintain on account of
their being of that Communion;
so that by finding these we have all
their particular Doctrines redu-
ced to their first Principles. And
the discovery of the weakness of the
proofs producible for these (upon
the former Supposition that they are
obliged to prove them) is as clear a
Discovery of the Justice of the Re-
formation, from the first Principles
as the nature of the thing will bear.*

VI. USE. §. 28. *A sixth and last*

*Usefulness of this Hypo-
thesis above others is, that it is capa-
ble of a more easie proof, and a proof
more likely to prevail ad homines.
For the several Parties among our
Adversaries will not only grant us
each*

A Preface.

each of the Premises, but undertake to prove them for us; and an indifferent Person will not be beholden to either of them for the Conclusion. That he cannot be true to the Principles of their Communion (or, (to use their language) that he can be no sound thorough Catholick) who does not hold Infallibility, and that confined to that part of the Church which is in their Communion on account of their being virtually Catholick, the Jesuites, and other high Papalins will affirm, and it is that for which they contend. To them therefore I shall refer all those of that Communion, who shall doubt of the cogency of the proofs here produced, for further satisfaction. I could heartily wish that the odium of this reference might make them decline the Service; and

A Preface.

Should take it for a highly commendable condescension, if such as they, who have devoted themselves to the Service of the Catholick Church, could be perswaded to declare their dislike of Principles so pernicious to Catholick Peace. But I fear it is a favour too great to be expected from them. If any therefore doubt of the other Premiss, viz. the indefensibleness of this challenge to Infallibility, and of this Notion of a Catholick Church virtual, on which that challenge must be grounded, he may be pleased to consult those of their Writers who defend the Supremacy of General Councils, or rather of the Catholick Church diffusive. So that this way of proceeding will be most sutable for all sorts of Adversaries. If they read it with a desire of satisfaction, they will

A Preface.

will find that more easie when they shall consider that it proceeds only on that which themselves do partly grant true already, so that there will only one Premiss remain concerning which they can desire further satisfaction. If they read it with a design of confutation, they will also find that more difficult when they shall remember that they cannot undertake it without engaging a very considerable Party among themselves in the defence of these Fundamental Principles of their whole Communion.

§. 28. Many great and considerable improvements might have been also made of this difference of their Authors in matters of so great importance to their common Interests, which may hereafter be more fully enlarged on as themselves

A^d Preface.

shall administer a further occasion for it. This will shew how little reason they have to boast of their Unity when it thus appears that they are so little agreed in these Principles of their Unity. So that, as it has already appeared that their difference herein must in reason oblige them to separate in their Communion, if they act conformably to their Principles, so nothing but a provocation like that which was given to Luther and Henry the Eighth, can be wanting to them who deny this Monarchy of the Pope, to make them do as they did, viz. actually to divide their Communion as their Principles already oblige them. This will also let them see how little advantage their Laity is like to have above ours in judging of the Controversies which divide

A Preface,

divide *our* Communions. They would have them take the Judge of Controversies's word for the Particulars. That may be when they have found him. But when there are different Pretenders (as there are here, the Pope, the Council, and the Church diffusive) how shall they judge who has the justest Claim? Must they judge of the reasons, at least of Credibility? That is it that we would have them do, and for which we are blamed as putting them upon a task too difficult for them, or encouraging them to entertain too good an Opinion of their own abilities. Must they take the Pope's word in the Case? But he is yet only a Party; and, till the Motives of Credibility be tryed, can have no advantage above others his Competitors. And then,

A Preface.

why may not They be trusted also? If they be all trusted, their Pretensions being so inconsistent, the Laick, who trusts them, must still be left as irresolute as ever. Must they therefore follow the judgment of their most Credible Divines concerning it? But that will again be as hard a task as the former, to be able, in so great apparent Equality, to distinguish who are the most Credible; especially abstracting from the merit of the Cause. And what advantage the favourers of the Papacy have in numbers, that the others have in disinterestedness, which will go very far in recommending the Credibility of an Authority in such a Case as this is. Besides the greatest Authority of Divines will not by themselves be allowed for any more than a probable

A Preface.

ble, and therefore a very fallible, inducement. But how much more so, when there are other Divines as eminent as themselves of another Judgment? And even Infallibility it self, if it be received on a Fallible recommendation, will still amount to no higher than a Fallible Proof; which even themselves cannot judge sufficient for their purpose in such a Case as this is. If both Pretenders and Divines be trusted on both sides as far as their Pretensions are not inconsistent with each other, this will effectually serve my purpose, and convince the Laick, who trusts them, of the insecurity of their whole Communion. For he must thus be obliged to grant both the Premisses of the Argument by which I have here proved it insecure. The Major is this,

A Preface.

Infallibility, as appropriated to the Roman Communion by their Title to their being virtually Catholick, that is, by their adhering to the Papacy as a Principle of Catholick Unity in the sense above explained, is the Fundamental Principle of that whole Communion as distinct from others :

This he must believe on the Authority of the Popes themselves who have declared for it, and of the Jesuites, and the rest of the high Papalins. The Minor this :

But this Authority of the Papacy (*on which the Title of that whole Communion to Infallibility is grounded*) is false and improbable.

This

A Preface.

This he must also for the same reason believe on the Authority of all those who defend the Supremacy of General Councils, or of the diffusive Catholick Church, So that in this way of judging by Authorities (which is agreeable to the Genius and Principles and Arguments of that Church against us in other like Cases) the Laity, at least, must be obliged to distrust their whole Communion, as Fundamentally grounded on an unwarrantable Principle. But of these and other like matters, perhaps a larger account may be given on future occasions.



A positive

A C C O U N T

OF THE

Fundamental Controverſie

On which

Depend all other Diſputes,

betwixt the *Romaniſts* and the
other *Communiſons* of *Chriſten-*
dom, with a ſhort diſcovery of
the little evidence they have
on the *Roman* ſide in this Con-
troverſie.

BY the Fundamental Con-
troverſie, I mean that on
which the particular Con-
troverſies do depend, and wherein
what is maintained by the *Ch.* of
Rome, does ſo nearly concern her
that

that the whole Subsistence as a *distinct Communion*, must adequately depend on the Truth or Falseness of it. And her Assertion herein is that *Fundamental Principle*, the confutation of which is alone sufficient for convicting her of the *guilt* of that Separation of Communion, which has been caused by her unwarrantable Impositions in the particular Disputes, and for excusing all others who have permitted themselves to be excluded from her Communion rather than they would profess the belief of Errors, which was required as a Condition of their Communion. So that the Confutation of this *Fundamental Principle* does virtually and consequentially contain a resolution of all other particular Controversies debated between us.

For

(3)

For finding out this *Funda-*
mental Principle, I sup-
pose,

1. That the first *For-*
mal Separation (I will ^{Suppositions.}
not yet say *Schism*, for that im-
plies a fault in it, which is to ap-
pear from what follows) was made
by the *Romanists*, at least as to us
in *England*, with whom they
communicated in the same Pub-
lick Offices, till they separated
themselves upon the
prohibition of *Pius V.* ^{(a) Feb. 25. 1569.}

2. That this *Formal Separation*
without sufficient *positive grounds*
for it (though there were no suf-
ficient *convictive grounds* to the
contrary) is the Sin of *Formal*
Schism; which is as properly in-
curred, if the Separation be *unne-*
cessary, as if it be *unreasonable* if it
be

be *without*, as if it be *against* reason.

3. This being supposed, for our Justification, who were only *passive* in the *Separation*, it is not requisite that we *confute* their pretences, but it is abundantly sufficient that the *proofs* produced by them are not *directly conclusive* to their purpose.

4. This *purely-negative* way of proceeding, that they want sufficient ground to justify their Practice, being alone sufficient for our purgation, the proof that the grounds of their separating from us were sufficient (which is their *positive Assertion*) will be incumbent on our Adversaries, and we cannot be obliged to disprove them.

5. This obligation to *Prove* is
in-

incumbent on them, not only as they are the *first Separaters* (which may only concern us of the *English Communion*) but also as the *Imposers* of their own Sentiments on others as Conditions of Catholic Communion. Which will also relate to *forreign Protestants*, who were driven from their Communion, being not suffered to continue in it but on such Conditions.

6. Our Adversaries being thus obliged to give a *Positive account* of their own proceedings; they have no way to justify themselves but by vindicating that on which themselves lay the stress of their Separation (so that, if they fail here, no other proof will be sufficient for proving the necessity of it) which was noted to be meant by the *Fundamental Principle*.

Here

Here therefore two things will be necessary to be shewn; 1. what this is on which they lay this stress; 2. that it is no way justifiable.

For the First, it is clear

Proposi-
tions. 1. That the particular Propositions debated betwixt us are not by themselves thought necessary, to our Salvation, *necessitate medii*, so as that our Ignorance or disbelief of them should deprive us of some necessary Truth, without which we cannot be saved. For they themselves excuse such as did disbelieve them, as we do, before the definition of their Church.

2. That, even supposing we were erroneous in things not thus necessary, yet this were not sufficient

cient to justify their Separation or Imposition on *intrinsick accounts*; that is, an Error of so small importance, as to the value of the thing, could not in that regard, of its *intrinsick value*, excuse either their *Separation* from us because we hold it, or their so rigorous *Imposition* of their own sentiments on us concerning it.

3. That as there is no *Intrinsick Necessity* of the Truth of the Propositions for our Salvation, so neither is there that *Extrinsick Evidence* of their being revealed by the Apostles that must necessarily argue, in him that should deny them, an *Irreverence* and *Obstinacy* against the *Divine Veracity*, on which their Credibility depends. This also appears from their excusing the Errors

rors of the Antients, who if they had had such Evidence in their times, could not have been inculpably Erroneous. Which they take up from what S. *Augustine* had said to that purpose, in his Disputes with the *Donatists* concerning the Case of St. *Cyprian*, whom he therefore makes more excusable in the same Error of *Rebaptizing Hereticks* than the *Donatists*, because he lived *before*, but they *after*, the *Nicene* decision of that whole Dispute. Nor 2. do themselves pretend that any Error, which may not be presumed *obstinately persisted in*, is sufficient to justify a Separation from the Communion of Persons so Erroneous.

4. Hence it follows that, seeing neither the *Intrinsic Necessity* of
the

the Propositions themselves, nor their *Extrinsic Evidence* Antecedently to the definition of the *Church*, are, on their own Principles, sufficient to justify the Severity of their proceedings against us: The only thing they have more to alledge for it must be our *Disobedience* in disbelieving those Propositions notwithstanding the *Authority* which their *Church* has given them by her Definition.

5. That the *Obedience* required to these Propositions is not only *not to make Parties and Divisions* in the *Church* against them (such as our Church is generally thought to require to the xxxix. Articles) but also *Positively to believe them*, not only as *Truths*, but also as *matters of Faith*.

E

6. That

6. That this *Positive Belief* of their Church's Definitions exteriorly professed in joyning in their Offices, and in abstaining from the Communion even of *Peaceable Dissenters*, and censuring them as *Hereticks*, cannot *veraciously*, nor consequently without *Sin*, be performed without an *Internal Assent*.

7. That this *Internal Assent* cannot safely be given without a *satisfactory conviction* of the *Truth* of the Propositions so assented to.

8. And therefore, that such an Assent may be given to Propositions defined by their Church, only on account of her Authority, it is requisite that her *Authority* be such a *Medium* as may assure us of the *Truth* of those Propositions.

9. This *Assurance* (if it be not, accord-

according to the Doctrine of their greatest Pretenders to Reason, *Mathematical*, yet) must, at least for *matters of Faith* (and such these Definitions are by themselves esteemed) be *Moral*, that is, such as may exclude all *Probabilty*, if not all *Possibility*, of *Doubting*, whether they be *True*.

10. That *Authority*, which, upon its *own account*, may be an Argument to convince us of the Truth of her Definitions, must not be such as must depend on the use of *Means*: both 1. because that will leave a Liberty for such as are competent Judges of them to have recourse from such *Authority* to the *Means themselves* on which such her Credibility will depend, which the *Romanists* will by no means permit: And 2. be-

cause the *Means* are by themselves acknowledged frequently *Fallible*, and the *Infallibility* only affixed to the *Conclusions*.

11. That *Authority* which may assure us of the *Truth* of its Definitions, independently on the *Means*, must needs be *Infallible* in its *Judgment*. Which though some few late Authors have endeavoured to avoid, yet the Generality of them have found themselves in pursuance of the former Principles, obliged to assert it.

12. This *Infallibility* of *Judgment*, surpassing the use of *Ordinary Means*, must needs be *Supernatural* and *Extraordinary*; and therefore as to the *light* by which it judges, it must be assisted by *new Revelations*, though it be conversant about no *newly-Revealed Objects*.

13. This

13. This *Infallibility* is by them challenged to themselves by virtue of those Promises of the *Spirit* in the Scriptures, which themselves confess to belong only to the *Catholic Ch.* not to any one particular Denomination of *Christians*.

14. That therefore their *Title* to this *Infallibility* must, according to their own Principles, be resolved into those Proofs whereby they make out their Title of being the *Catholic Church*.

15. They themselves do not, nor can nor, pretend to be the *Catholic Ch. diffusive*; that is, that all the *Regular, legal, original Successors* to the Apostles in all *Apostolical Sees* (most of which they cannot deny to have been in the Oriental parts) have ever submitted to their Authority, or are united to them in external

visible Communion. Nay, they have condemned a much greater number of *Apostolical Sees* than they have among themselves.

16. That therefore the Notion of *Catholick*, to which they may with any colour pretend, must be so limited as that it may agree to a *Party of Christians* in opposition to others.

17. That though it may indeed be true, admitting an *Appeal* to the *Primitive records*, that a *particular Church* may hold all that which was *originally* taught by the *Catholic Church diffusive*, without any novel abusive Impositions that may oblige any Conscientious Persons to keep off from her Communion, and so by *accident* may deserve the name of *Catholick*, as that name distinguishes from other

ther Christian Societies of *Hereticks* and *Schismaticks*. Yet speaking of such an Authority as they own in the *Roman Church*, which may prescribe against such *Appeals*, so that its own only sense is to be *presumed* to be the Sense of the *Catholick Church*, without particular convincing Evidences of the concurrence of all in the *Primitive Ages* with them, this plainly requires that this Notion of *Catholick* be certainly *fixed*, and fixed to a *particular Judicatory*, and this Antecedently to a tryal by the *Primitive Records*. For this *prescribing against an Appeal* so rational as to the nature of the thing, must plainly imply an *obliging Jurisdiction*, Antecedently to, and therefore Independently on, that tryal. And *Jurisdiction*

can signifie nothing unless the Judicatory to whom it belongs, be also notorious, and notorious also Antecedently to the same tryal. So that in this way of proceeding it must necessarily be supposed that *one certain part* of the *Catholick Church* can never cease to be *Catholick*, nor to have a *Jurisdiction* over the *Catholick Church diffusive*.

18. These things cannot be ascertained to a *particular Church*, so as to prescribe against the now-mentioned way of trying it, without maintaining the Notion of a *Catholick Church Virtual*. That is, we cannot be assured that a *particular Church* must necessarily be *Catholick*, Antecedently to the tryal of its *Catholicism* by a recourse to the *Primitive Records*, but by being first assured that that particular

particular Church shall never fail of being *Catholick* it self, and that all other particular Churches must approve of their *Catholicism* by their conformity to that which can never be otherwise. So that on these terms the knowledge of that one Church, and what is maintained by her, will be *virtually* a knowledge of the *Catholick Church diffusive*, and what ought to be maintained by them. Which things put altogether, do plainly make up that which our Adversaries mean when they speak of a *Catholick Church virtual*.

19. This Notion of a *Catholick Church virtual*, which may agree to one part of the

E 5

Catholick

Catholick Church diffusive in contradiction to all others, must imply such a *Principle of Unity* to which all the rest are obliged, though that one part only do *actually* adhere to it.

20. This *Principle of Unity* must not only be a Principle of *Order*, but of *Influence*. For it is only by virtue of this *Influence* of this one Church over all others that we can conclude that all others are obliged to be like it; and it is only on this obligation of all other Churches to be like her that her Title to the name of the *Catholick Church Virtual* is adequately grounded.

21. This *Principle of Unity* must be in the *Governours* of such a particular Church. For our *Adversaries* will not have the *Promises*.

Promises of the Spirit made to the People, but to their Governours. So that the People can have no further Right in them, but on condition of adhering to their Governours, who therefore must be the first Principle of Unity.

22. This Principle of Unity must not depend on the Authority of the Church diffusive. Otherwise that same Authority of the Church diffusive might recall it, in which Case the adhering to it would not prove a certain Note of Catholicism.

23. To apply therefore all this to the Romanists, their whole pretence of being the Catholick Church is adæquately grounded in that Notion of a Catholick Church virtual, whereby they confine it to that Multitude of Christians who
are

are united under a visible Monarchical Head as a Principle of their Unity, to which, Jure Divino, all are bound to be obedient.

24. This Monarchical Head to which they pretend a nearer interest than others, is the *Papacy*.

The Summary.

Seeing therefore that nothing else can excuse their *new* *impositions* but the *Authority* by which they are imposed: And Seeing that no *Authority* can be sufficient for their purpose to oblige their Subjects *internally* to believe what is neither *Necessary* as to its matter, nor *Evident* as to its proof, Antecedently to the Definition of such an *Authority*, but one

one that must be *Infalli-*
ble: Seeing that they ^{Prop. 7.}
 who do not in *terms* pre- ^{8, 9, 10,}
 tend the *Popes Infallibility* necessa- ^{11, 12.}
 ry (and they who do so, already
 own what I would prove that all
 must own according to their Prin-
 ciples) can make no Plea to *Infal-*
libility, but from those ^{Prop. 13.}
Promises of the *Spirit*
 which themselves confess to have
 been primarily made to the *Cat-*
holick Church; and therefore
 though an *Infallibility*, even in
Judgment, were granted to be-
 long to the *Catholick Church*, yet
 that can signifie nothing to our
 Adversaries purpose till
 they can prove & them- ^{Prop. 14.}
 selves to be that *Catholick Church*
 to which alone those *Promises*
 confessedly belong: Seeing evi-
 dently

- 4 Prop. 15. *dently they are not the
 Catholick Church diffu-
 sive, and can therefore only pre-
 tend to the Title of their being
 the Catholick Church*
 5 Prop. 16. *virtual: Seeing this*
 17, 18. *Notion of the Catholick
 Church Virtual must necessarily
 imply such a Principle*
 6 Prop. 19. *of Unity to which all the
 Catholick Church diffusive is obli-
 ged to adhere, as to a certain
 Standard of their Catholicism;
 and this Principle of Unity, to
 which they can lay claim above o-
 ther Christian Societies,*
 7 Prop. 21, 23, 24. *is only the Papacy; and
 the Papacy, as a Principle
 of Unity, must be a Principle, not
 of Order only, but of*
 8 Prop. 20. *Influence; and that in-
 9 Prop. 22. dependently on the
 Judgment*

Judgment of the *Catholick Church* *diffusive*: All these things being considered together, It will plainly follow, that, if this *influential independent power* of the *Papacy* cannot be proved, all their pretences to *Infallibility*, or even to any *Authority* for deciding these Controversies between us, must fall to the ground; and consequently all their *particular Decisions* depending on them will neither be *valid in Law*, nor *obliging in Conscience*, which will leave their *Separation* and *Impositions* destitute of any pretence that may excuse them from being *Schismatical*.

This is therefore the *Fundamental Principle* on which all their Authority in defining all other particular Doctrines must originally

originally depend: And to shew that this Principle is insufficiently proved, will alone be enough to invalidate all their other Definitions.

Secondly, Therefore to shew the insufficiency of their proof of it: This Proof must either be (a) from Tradition. And for this it is observable that,

I. This Notion of the *Catholic Church Virtual*, if it had been *True*, must have been originally delivered by the unanimous consent of the *Catholic Church diffusive*. We cannot judge otherwise unless we suppose a great defect, either of the *Apostles*, in *not teaching*, or of the *Church*, in *not preserving* the memorial of such

a *Fundamental Principle* of their *Unity*.

II. This Topick, of *Tradition* delivered down by the *Catholick Church diffusive*, is the only proper one for the Church who pretends to this Authority to prove it by. And till it be *proved*, and proved to the *judgment* of *particular Subjects*, there is no reason that She should expect that they should think themselves *obliged* in *Conscience* to submit to her Authority. For *Authority* can be no *rational Motive* to them to distrust their own Judgments, till it self be first *proved* and *acknowledged*. And therefore if it do not *appear*, and appear *to us* from this Topick, we can have no reason to believe it.

III. This Notion of the *Catholick*

lick Church Virtual does not appear to have been ever delivered as the sense of the *Catholick Church diffusive* :

1. Not of that *Catholick Church diffusive* which was extant in the *beginning* of the *Reformation*. For then
 1. The *Greeks*, and most of the *Eastern Christians* professedly oppose it.
 2. Many of the *Western Christians* themselves, especially of the *French* and *Germans*, did not believe it.
 3. The *Western Church* it self *Representative*, in four, by them reputed *General, Councils* of *Pisa*, *Constance*, *Siena*, and *Bafile*, did not own the Popes
- Su-

Supremacy as a *Principle* of *Catholick Unity*, but expressly by their *Canons* declared themselves to be his *Superiors*, and treated him as being wholly subject to their Authority. This was not long before the Reformation, and what they did had not then been repealed by any Authority comparable to theirs.

2. Not of the *Catholick diffusive Church* in *antienter times*.

1. Not of the *Greeks* ever since their *Schism*, as the *Latines* call it, under *Pho-tius*.

2. Before that time, even whilst they were united with

with the *Latin*s, the *Pope's Supremacy* was disowned by them in that famous 28. *Canon* of *Chalcedon*, which equalled the Bishop of *Constantinople* with him of *Rome*, and owned only an *Ecclesiastical Right* in both of them for the dignity of their Cities (which, as I have already * warned, will not suffice for our Adversaries purpose) that I may not now mention the *Canon* of *Constantinople* so expounded by the Fathers of *Chalcedon* in place, and maintained by the *Greek Emperors*. It was also disowned by the *Council* of *Antioch* against

Prop. 12.

gainst *Julius* ; Disowned
by the *African Fathers* ,
by whom the only Plea the
Popes had from the *Council* of *Nice* was found to
be a forgery.

3. Not of the *Catholic* diffu-
sive Church in those *Primi-*
tive times, while the *Christi-*
ans lived under *Heathen*
Emperours : For,

1. The *Romanists* them-
selves are unwilling to be
tryed by them, unless we
will allow them to quote
from the *Decretal Epistles*,
&c, which Learned Men
among themselves do con-
fess to be *suspicious* , or
manifest Forgeries.

2. *Ancient*

Ep. 182.
ad Mart.
Mayer. 2. *Aeneas Sylvius*, who was afterwards Pope *Pius II.* acknowledged that before the *Council of Nice* "little respect was had to the *Bishop of Rome* above others.

3. It appears by the freedom wherewith *Pope Stephen* was resisted by *St. Cyprian*, and *Pope Victor* by the *Asiatick Bishops*, and by *St. Irenaeus*. And

Ep. 72.
ad Scroph.
fratr. 4. By the *Canon of Carthage* under *St. Cyprian*, which declared that no *Bishop* was subject to another, but that every one was Supreme in his own charge under God; not now to mention other passages in him to the same

5. By the weakness of the Testimonies alledged to this purpose, the *Presidency in the Region of the Romans* in *Ignatius*, the *powerful Principality* in *St. Irenaeus*, the *Pontificatus Maximus* Ironically derided by *Tertullian*, and the *one Bishop and one See* in *St. Cyprian*, &c.

(a) For the *Scriptures*, themselves do not seem very confident of them without the *Expositions* of the *Fathers*.

AN



A N
ANSWER
T O
Six Queries

Proposed to a *Gentlewoman*
of the Church of *ENG-*
LAND, by an Emissary of
the Church of *R O M E*;
fitted to a Gentlewomans ca-
pacity.

By *HENRY DODWELL M. A.*
and sometimes Fellow of *Trinity*
Colledge near DUBLIN.

L O N D O N,

Printed for *Benj. Tooke*, and are to be sold
at the *Ship* in *St. Paul's Church-yard.*
1 6 7 6.

831:03

T H E
C O N T E N T S.

- Q. 1. *Whether any one going
from the Church of England,
and dying a Roman Catholick
can be saved?* page 1.
- Q. 2. *Whether they be idolaters,
or No?* 39
- Q. 3. *Where was the Church of
England before Luther's time?*
48
- Q. 4. *Why all the Reformed
Churches are not United in
One?* 81
- Q. 5. *Why the Church of England
doth not hold up to Confession,
Fasting-days, Holy Oyl, which
we our Selves commend?* 94
- Q. 6.

The Contents.

Q. 6. Why was Reformation
done by Act of Parliament?

110

ERRATA.

P. 34 l. 13 before *et* add *may*. p. 42. l. 17.
after *office* add *of*. p. 58. l. 10. *even* for *when*.
p. 92. l. 2. *few* for *fewer*. p. 115. l. 8. for *its* r. *the*.

AN

A P R E F A C E.

IT is of no further concernment to acquaint the Publick with the occasion of penning these Papers, than as the occasion might have an influence on the design; and as it may be very useful to inform the Reader of the design, that he may the better know what to expect in the performance.

He may therefore be pleased to understand that the following Queries were tendred to a Gentlewoman of the Communion of the Church of England by a Romanist, who had a design of se-

A ducing

A Preface.

ducing her; and that they were answered by another hand, but on such Principles, or in such a way of management, as that it did not give her the desired satisfaction. This gave occasion to some that were concerned for her to shew the Paper to some others in order to be inviting them to undertake it in a way that might be likely to prove more successful. By this means of communication it came at length to my hands from a Person who first desired my Opinion concerning it, and then with some earnestness importuned

A Preface.

portuned me to commit my thoughts to writing. Pursuant therefore to this occasion, my design was in the first place to shew from sound Principles, that the Church of England is able to defend her Reformation from the Errors of the Romanists, and to clear her self, as far as She is charged with that Breach of Communion which followed thereupon, without giving any advantage to the Non-Conformists to justify either their first Separation from Us, or their Eternal Subdivisions from one a-

A Preface.

another. Nor was I willing to engage a Person in the Gentlewomans condition, in any Controversies that might be spared without Injury to the merit of the Cause; or to debate even such as could not so be spared, by such Arguments as might exceed her opportunities of Enquiring, or her capacity of Judging, so as to oblige her to depend on the conduct of others more Inquisitive and Judicious. But I have either waved Authorities where I could debate the Case by Arguments less liable to Dispute, and better

A Preface.

better suited to the understanding of a Gentlewoman; or where I have been necessitated to insist on them, I have endeavoured to make out their Credibility by such Presumptions as are easie to be understood, and familiar in parallel Cases, and generally granted as most Prudent, whenever unskilful Persons find themselves obliged to acquiesce in the conduct of Persons more skilful and Judicious than themselves. And I have purposely avoided all citations of Authors, even where

A 3 necessary,

A Preface.

necessary, but such as were to be had, even in English, and therefore might be consulted by the Gentlewoman her self.

I confess those other Reasonings fit for Scholars, as they are more subtle, so they are withal more solid and conclusive. But withal I consider, i. that those things wherein Scholars have the advantage of unlearned Persons, are principally such wherein Reading is absolutely necessary for their Historical conveyance to us. It is certainly impossible for any to know what Doctrines

A Preface.

Doctrines were maintained in the Apostles times (and consequently what Doctrines are true, where they are supposed capable of no other Evidence of their being true, but because they were so maintained) without insight into the several Histories & Authors of the intermediate Ages through which they are to be deduced. But for other things whose evidence of their being true, does not depend on such a conveyance, the Reason of the thing is a sufficient Evidence; and of this every equally rational Person, how

A Preface.

little soever he be conversant in Authors, is an equally competent Judge. And of this kind are many of the things here mentioned, on which the stress of the Cause depends. The prudent Reader will easily discern which they are, without my instancing. And 2. even in those things which depend on Positive Revelation, and wherein the only means of our Assurance of them is Historical Tradition ; though it be indeed true that Persons of little Reading cannot so competently assure themselves of the writings and

A Preface.

and opinions of former Ages, without the assistance of others more conversant in those Studies: yet since it is not the way of Prudent rational Persons, therefore to conclude a thing to have been revealed by the Apostles, because such Authors tell us that it was so; much less because such Authors maintained it, as their own Opinion; but first to assure themselves of such things on which the Credibility of such Authors in such matters may be made clear to us, and then of those Expressions from whence they conclude such
Authors

A Preface.

Authors to have given Testimony to such a thing as an Apostolical Tradition : it is plain that the judgment of these things depends wholly on the reason of the things themselves. And therefore where Learned Men are agreed, as to their accounts of the Authors and their Expressions; and where the only remaining Dispute is, whether such undoubted Works of such Authors be competent for the conveyance of a Tradition, and whether such Expressions, considered in all their circumstances, come home to the Controversies
at

A Preface;

at present debated; these are things whereof common Prudence and a cultivated natural Judgment may as well qualifie Men to pass a Censure as the greatest Reading imaginable. And this seems to me the best way in affairs of this nature, to wave such things as were disputed among Learned men concerning their Historical Informations, and only to found my reasonings on their unanimous Concessions. And most of the Controversies betwixt Us and the Romanists are of that nature as to be capable of this way

A Preface.

way of management. Now this way of not intermeddling in the Disputes of Learned men, but only proceeding on their unquestioned concessions is (as most solid and satisfactory to the most accurate Learned men themselves, so) most prudent and easie for those who are unlearned. And 3. even as to those other things wherein I have indeed proceeded on popular Presumptions, yet considering that these are the only reasons which God has fitted to the capacities of the greatest part of Mankind, and that

A Preface.

that God is in his Goodness concerned to give them reasons sufficient for their direction, and that the nature of the things themselves is of importance to his Government, and that it is therefore requisite that their direction be such as may not only excuse their mistakes, but secure them of the Truth itself; I say, these things being considered, there will be reason to believe that however fallible such general Presumptions may be in their own nature, yet that God in his Goodness has so ordered
the

A Preface.

the matter in affairs of this nature, as that those who are guided by these Presumptions may by the use of them be secured of the Truth it self in these particulars.

As for the Method observed in this Discourse, it is such as I conceived most clear and comprehensive in few words, and yet withal most accurate and satisfactory to a doubting Person. For any one may be much more secure of a Consequence when he is first secured of all its Principles, and he can much better judge of them when he has an intire.

A Preface.

tire prospect of them in the natural order wherein they lye, and wherein they are necessary for the deduction of such a Consequence. Yet I have neither deduced my Principles too remotely, but as near as I could find them clear and indisputable; nor have insisted on the proof of those that were clear, any further than I conceived it necessary to do so from the actual Disputes concerning the Consequence. And I have been careful rather to prove than to confute; which I conceived to be a course,

A Preface.

course, as less Invidious to Adversaries (who should find themselves no further concerned than as the consequences of positive Truths might make them concern'd) so also more satisfactory to a Person in the Gentlewomans condition. And in the whole I am so little conscious of any design of displeasing any to whom Truth it self might not prove displeasing, as that if any Adversary shall think it worth his time to Answer what I have said, I am not my self affraid of provocation from any thing which he can say in following my Precedent.

(1)

A N

ANSWER

T O

Six Queries, &c.

Q. 1. Whether any one going from the Church of England, and dying a Roman Catholic can be saved.

I. IF by the words [*can be saved*] be meant a *possibility* in regard of the *means*, we then deny it. For we hold that such Errors are maintained in that Communion as are in their own *nature* destructive of *Salvation*.

B

Such

Such are

1. The Doctrines even of their
** Vid Confid. & Prof. Concern.* ** Church* which oblige
 them to do mischief (as
 those concerning the Popes *Supremacy* over Princes in *Temporals*, and concerning their Duty

† For the Jesuites, for
 the Province, Let. and
 the Moral Theolog.
 of the Jesuites; and
 for the rest of that
 Communion, the Jesu-
 ites defence of them-
 selves by way of recom-
 mendation against others.

of *prosecuting He-
 reticks*) The †
 looseness of their
*Casuistical Divi-
 nity*, countenan-
 ced by such Au-
 thorities of *Casu-*

ists as must needs influence such
 Persons as act conformably to the
 Principles of that Communion;
 and their generally allowing a
 greater Liberty to such per-
 sons as are desirous to reconcile
 their Vices with their hopes of
 Eternity, by their licentious ap-
 plications

plications of those two Distinctions of *Precepts* and *Counsels*, and of *Mortal* and *Venial Sins*, whereby they make most *Duties* Counsels, and most *Sins* only Venial. Which danger is the more considerable to an Ignorant Person, who for want of skill of her own, must in Prudence, and by the Principles of that Communion, be obliged to trust such un-secure Guides.

2. Not to mention the ill influence of several of their Doctrines on the Lives of such as own them; the very *imposing* them as matters of *Faith*, the *Excommunicating* and *Anathematizing* all that deny them, the condemning Dissenters as guilty of *Heresy* and *Schism* (at least what they call *Material*) the inserting

several of their controverted Doctrines into their Liturgies, so that they who cannot believe them, cannot veraciously joyn with them in their Devotions, are Innovations from the liberty allowed in the Primitive Church, wherein many (whom all own for excellent Persons and good Catholics) never owned, nay some of them doubted of, or contradicted, such Conditions of Communion; in sum, their unreasonable grounds of *dividing Catholick Communion*, and their *Uncharitableness to Dissenters*, are Errors dangerous to the Salvation of the Person owning and abetting them. For all will own, even the *Romanists* themselves, that the Crime of breaking Catholick Communion, where it is justly imputed

puted, is destructive of Salvation.

3. Several *Abuses* of that Church (I say of the *Church*, not only of *particular Persons* in it) are so gross as that several of the most eminent and candid men of their own Communion have owned them for such: such as *Prayer in an unknown Tongue*, *denying the Chalice to the Laity*, *Fabulous Saints and Stories* still continued in the best approved Ecclesiastical Offices, *Martyrs canonized for bad Causes* conducing to the greatness of the Roman See, as *Becket* for Example: Yet by the Principles of that Communion, pretending to *Infallibility*, it is impossible that any *Abuse* (in defence of which their *Church* is engaged, as She

is here) should ever be *reformed*, because it is impossible that a Church, so pretending to be *Infalible*, should ever grant any such thing to be an *Abuse*. And many more Abuses are by the moderate Persons of their Communion owned in the *Court of Rome*, which yet by the power allowed to the *Court* over their *Church*, by the general consent of the *Church* it self, cannot possibly be reformed. Seeing therefore that the *Church of Rome* does thus oppose all possible Reformation of Abuses of this nature; and seeing that, whilst these Abuses are not reformed, many of them may justify a Separation, and most of them may do it when all hopes of Reformation are professedly opposed; Catholick Peace on such terms

terms as may, not only lawfully, but commendably, be yielded, will be impossible. And the abetting of such a Party as makes *Catholick Peace* on just terms *impossible*, must needs be an Error destructive of Salvation. This is a mischief unavoidably consequent to mistakes in a Society pretending to be *Infallible*.

As these Errors are thus of their own nature destructive of Salvation, so going over to that Communion from another, does naturally involve the Person doing so in the actual guilt of the Errors themselves :

1. Because *Communicating* (according to all) does involve the Persons Communicating in

B 4. the

the guilt of such Errors, at least, as are imposed as *conditions* of the *Communion* , as these are in the Church of *Rome*. This needs not to be proved against the *Romanists* who insist on it against Us as much as We do against them.

2. This must especially hold in such as *revolt* from our Church to theirs: both because such an embracing of their Communion is more an Argument of *choice* and *designed preference* in such as leave others to come to it, than in such as are born in it, and consequently must signify a more express approbation of the terms of it; and because more *explicit recantations* of our Doctrines are required even from *Laick Revolters* , than from such as are born in it.

3. Because

3. Because the *Resignation* of *Judgment* is expected more intire from *Women* and *Laicks* than from *skilful Persons* (who may in some Cases be allowed the liberty of their own Judgments even by the Principles of that Communion) so that Persons in the Gentlewomans condition, may by this means come to be Responsible not only for the dangerous *Doctrines* of their *whole Church*, but also for the *Personal Errors* of their *Priests* and particular *Confessors*: both as they are (by the Principles of that Communion) allowed to be the Authentical Proponents of the *Doctrines* of their *Church* to *unlearned Persons* (who are not themselves qualified for Judging concerning them) as their Church is of the *Doctrines*

of *Christ* to the *Learned*; and as the same Rules of *Prudence* oblige them as strongly to trust their *particular Priests* for *Opinions*, as they do their *Church* for *Doctrines of Faith*, where they are still presumed as incapable of Judging themselves.

II. If by this *possibility of Salvation* mentioned in the *Question*, be meant only [*a possibility of the Event*] notwithstanding the dangerousness of the *condition* of Persons of that *Communion*, upon account of their being of it; then the Resolution will depend on this: How far Errors of their own nature *damnative* may not prove actually *destructive* to the Salvation of the particular Erroneous Person, on account

count of the *Ignorance* and *Unvoluntariness* with which the Person comes to be engaged in such Errors? For on these accounts it may be conceived that the Errors may either not be imputed to her at all, or be imputed in so low a degree as to become pardonable by the general Stipulations and promises of the Gospel for the pardoning of Sins of *Inadvertency* and *humane frailty*, which are supposed expiable by a general Care of fulfilling the conditions of the Evangelical Covenant, together with a general implicate Repentance of Sins unknown as well as known.

Now of these two waies whereby an Error *damnative* of its own *Nature* may be hindred from proving *actually damnative* in.

in the *Event* to the *Erroneous Person*, it is only an *Invincible Ignorance* (that is, such as can be remedied by no means that are in the power of the Person who is supposed *Erroneous*) that can hinder all Imputation of her Error to her; and only such a degree of *Vincible Ignorance* can suffice for extenuating the Imputation so far as to render it pardonable in the way now mentioned, that is very hardly avoidable by the Person; considering the frailty to which her condition in this Life is obnoxious. So that for judging concerning the Condition of *Revolters* (which is the Gentlewomans case) the Enquiry will be, what degree of Ignorance they are capable of that may make their Errors *Involun-*

tary? that is, How far such as they are may be capable of being *Ignorant* of their Duty to adhere to ours as the true Communion? And for discerning this these following Particulars would be fit to be considered.

1. That we are all agreed (*Romanists* as well as *Protestants*) that all sorts of Persons (*Ignorant* as well as *Learned*). are obliged to adhere to the true Communion (whatever that is) in contra-distinction to others, at least, under pain of losing the *Ordinary means of Salvation*, and consequently that comfortable *satisfaction* of the security of their own condition, which they who enjoy the *Ordinary means of Salvation* must needs be more capable of than they who are necessitated

cessitated to repose their whole confidence in Gods *Extraordinary Mercies*.

2. That all Persons being thus obliged by God to embrace the true Communion, the Inducements to it must be supposed sufficient for the conviction of all, and consequently suited to the capacities of all who are thus concerned to receive Conviction.

3. Therefore the *Reasons* being thus supposed sufficient for the conviction of all, there can be no pretence of *Invincible Ignorance* for any but such as are Ignorant of those Reasons, which cannot be supposed to be the case of *Revolters*.

Hence

Hence it follows, at least, that if *Revolters* act rationally, that is, Enquire *what* it is they leave, and *why*, and accordingly follow their Convictions as they ought, before their Change; they cannot be supposed capable of *Invincible Ignorance*. So that the only imaginable pretence for rendering their Error *Invincible*, must be the supposed *Invincibleness* of those *Prejudices* which may hinder a well-meaning Person, acting *conscientiously*, from acting *rationally*. Which must be either

1. *Opinions* conceived obligatory in *Conscience*, hindering the Persons embracing them from *Enquiry*, or following their own *Convictions*; of which kind many
- is-

instances may be produced which are favoured by the *Casuits* of the *Roman Church*: Or,

2. *Precipitation* in passing Sentence on a partial Evidence, resolving on some particular advantage of one Cause without considering its disadvantages, or the advantages of the contrary Cause, which might possibly over-weigh it if impartially considered: Or,

3. An *undiscernible favour* to one Cause more than another, whereby we wish it rather true in regard of its greater compliance with some particular Interest or Affection which may be thought *Innocent*, at least,
if

if not *commendable*; which may the more likely prejudice a well-meaning Conscientious Person, because it may indeed be *Prudent* in some Cases, and it is not easie for a Person acted by it to discern when it is not. But it is hard to conceive how any of these mistakes can be *Invincible* in *Revolters*.

Not the 1. for

1. There can be no reason to take up such Opinions so *gratuitously*, which are so Prejudicial to all Reasoning in general.

2. There can be no reason to take them for granted as *first Principles*, without Enquiry, (by which means very *absurd Propositions*

tions may be taken up by very *rational Persons*) where it is known that many skilful, and (as far as can be judged) Conscientious Persons do, not only question, but, deny them.

3. *Revolters* from us cannot as much as pretend any Prejudices of Education to excuse such mistakes, seeing that among Us they find them utterly discountenanced. And as they have thus neither *Reason*, nor (among Us) *Authority* that may induce them to the belief of those Doctrines: So neither

4. Can the *Authority* of our *Adversaries* be any probable inducement to persuade *Revolters* to the belief of these irrational Doctrines :

1. Because the *Romanists* themselves are sensible of the absurdity of these Doctrines, and their unserviceableness to their own Interests when they have to deal with Persons whom they desire to seduce; so that they are not likely to recommend such Doctrines to such Persons, as Credible, on account of their own Authority. For if they should offer to persuade such as they esteem Hereticks of the unlawfulness of intermeddling in Religious Disputes, or following their own Convictions in them, it would be the means to make it impossible to Profelyte such to their own Party.

2. If

2. If they should be so imprudent as to persuade them of the Truth of these Doctrines so prejudicial to their own interests in these Circumstances; yet the Person tempted would need no other Argument to confute them than their attempts to Proselyte her at the same time when they should teach her that it were unlawful to hearken to any Reasons, or to venture her own Judgment concerning them, if contrary to what at present she believed to be true.
3. Because if she must not trust her own Judgment, but rely on Authority, it would be most *Just*, as well as most *Prudent*, to trust the Authority

thority of her own Party whom she has experienced, than her Adversaries whom She has not; and therefore it could not be reasonable to trust Adversaries contradicting the eminent Guides of her own Party.

4. Because, at least, the Authority of Adversaries cannot be presumed in Reason so great, with a Person not yet of their Communion, as to oblige her to believe, on their account, what She her self thinks Irrational: Nay, rather whilst it is questioned how far their Authority is to be trusted (as it ought, in reason, to be considered before a change) and whilst the *private Judgment*

ment of the Person is trusted (as none else can be) in this debate ; what in her own judgment seems unreasonable would rather render the Authority suspected if it should recommend it, than be it self believed for the Authority.

Especially considering 5. that to such a one as is not yet perswaded of the Credibility of their *Authority*, this would afford a very prudent Argument for suspicion of their Integrity, when they should urge her to the belief of such things whose Truth they would not allow her liberty to examine by her own *private Judgment*.

Not

Not the 2. for

1. It is hard to conceive a Person educated in the true Church so ignorant of the advantages of her own way, as to be *Invincibly* perswaded by those of the contrary, which upon a compleat comparison are (by the Supposals laid down in the beginning of this Discourse) so very disproportionable to them, and which may appear so by the Judgment of all who are concerned to judge concerning them. Vid. II. 1, 2.

2. The fallacy of trusting such partial Representations is so easily discovered by the most ordinary *Experience* and *Prudence* in human affairs, and so universally acknowledged in all other ordinary

ordinary occurrences, as that it can hardly impose on any who proceeds with that Caution which all acknowledge requisite in changes of great and dangerous consequence, as all confess those of Religion to be.

3. Though a less advantage on one side above the other might suffice, where the Person were not pre-engaged in either; yet all confess the disturbance of a change, and the danger of venturing on an unexperienced way, so considerable, as that they are not to be attempted on *barely Equal terms*; which is a further warning for the Gentlewoman to be wary, who is tempted to change from the Principles of her Education.

4. Supposing the Person were so *ignorant* as not to discern the advantages of her own Communion above any other by her own observation, yet in that Case, it is on all sides held *Prudent* to hear on both sides what can be said by them who are *skilful*: which if She understand, and be able to judge of by her self, She must then (by the Supposals now mentioned) see the advantage of her own side; but if She does not, and so be necessitated, even in the choice of her Communion, to rely on the conduct of a Guide, it must in that Case be much more *Prudent* to trust a Guide whom She has experienced, than one whom She has not.

C

Not

Not the 3. for

1. That *Favour* which is wholly derived from the inclination of the *Affections* must needs be due to that side wherein the Person is already engaged: both in *Justice*, as all generous Persons conceive themselves obliged in all Cases capable of favour, to be favourable to their old Friends rather than others; and in *Prudence*, because by this means the disturbance of a change is best prevented.

2. If any *Favour* may be upon reasonable and well-meaning accounts extended to one Cause above others: Either because the tryal of its Truth is easier, or because its Truth (if it may be proved) may be conceived subservient to better purposes;

poses; as Mr. Cressy
confesses himself fa-
vourable to the Argu-
ments produced for a

Exordio.
Sect. 2. Ch.
16. §. 2. P.
162. Ed. 2.

Judge of Controversies, because
the decision of that Controversie
alone would prevent the trouble
of Enquiring into the rest: yet
even so (if this Favour be taken
up and managed as it ought to be
by a vertuous well-meaning Per-
son) it will not render the mi-
stake of a change *Invincible*.
For,

1. This Fayour (as far as it is
justifiable by reason) is to
be had for the Religion
wherein the Person had been
educated, and of which She
is actually possessed, upon
the same rational accounts
whereby that other Favour

is conceived justifiable, and in as high a degree of obligation; both as we are better able to judge of what we know already than we can be presumed to be of a strange Religion; and as we can be more confident in the practice of a Religion we have alwaies maintained, than we can in that which must suppose us convicted of having been formerly greatly mistaken.

2. This Favour, as far as it may be conceived *Prudent* and *Rational*, can only take place there where all other things are supposed Equal, which cannot be supposed in the true way.

3. This

3. This Favour ought not to hinder the Person from an *Enquiry* into the contrary Cause, unless the Evidence produced be very certainly convictive, which also cannot be supposed in the way we are speaking of.
4. This way of Favourable Presumption being the only way by which the generality of the Vulgar are capable to Judge, and there being in the true way inducements for all sorts of People; therefore it must be said that if this way be managed impartially, that is, if all the Presumptions on both sides be considered, this must bring them to the Truth.

Hence it follows, by the Principles of all Parties, that the Error of a *Revolver* can hardly be presumed *Invincible*, and consequently not *wholly Excusable*. So that for Judging concerning the Salvability of particular Persons, it only remains to be enquired further, *Whether they be capable of such a degree of Vincible Ignorance as may be expiable by a General Repentance, and the performance of all other Conditions of the Gospel in an Erroneous Communion?* And the Resolution of this depends on these Enquiries :

1. Whether the *Erroneous Communion* (the *Roman* for Example) embrace the Doctrine of *Repentance* so entirely, according to the
Con-

Conditions required of it in the Gospel, as that the Repentance performed in it may be presumed such as God will accept?

2. What degree of *Vincible Ignorance* is expiable by a *General Repentance*? For it is certain that all is not.
3. Whether a *Revolver* from our Communion be capable of that degree of *Vincible Ignorance* which is so expiable?

The exact Discussion of these things is too large to be insisted on at present, and therefore I shall only make application to the design of the Question. I shall therefore shew that what *Possibility of Salvation* soever we may allow to Persons of the Ro-

man Communion, yet it is no prudent ground to encourage one who is not already of it, to *re-volt* to it. To this purpose I desire it may be considered,

1. That all the grounds we pretend to have for our Charity, are rather *Negative* than *Positive*: rather our unsatisfiedness with those Arguments which pretend to prove them *actually damned*, than any Positive Convictions that any of them are *actually saved*.

2. That our *Charitable Presumptions* are principally grounded on things impossible to be known by *Us*, such as are the *uncovenanted Mercies* of God, and the *possibility of Sincerity*, and even *particular Explicite Repentance* of the *Error* in the *Person*;
so

so that it is very easie for *us* to be mistaken in our *Charity*, and we professedly chuse it as a *mistake* (if it should prove one) more pardonable than *Censoriousness*.

3. That the Case, concerning which we Judge *Charitably*, is so very *rare* and *extraordinary*, as that no particular *Erroneous Person* can be very confident that it is her own : Nay, when we say, that their Errors are of their *own Nature* destructive of Salvation, and that God has not interposed any *General Ordinary means* for preventing their proving actually damnative in the *Event*, it will thence follow that there are very just fears concerning the generality of their Communion, and consequently many odds to one

of the miscarriage of each particular Person, which the Gentlewoman may do well to think of seriously.

4. That the degree of *Penitence* which shall be accepted by God in a particular Case, upon account of his *uncovenanted Mercy*, is very *hard*, if not *impossible*, to be known by the Person concerned; so that even they who shall enjoy the *benefit* of it in the other World, yet want the *comfort* of it in this; and therefore can ground no confidence in any *Practice* undertaken on that Supposition.

5. That this Security is very much more hazardous, and more difficult to be Judged of, in Case of *Vincible*, than of *Invincible Ignorance*, which has been proved

ved to be generally the condition of Persons concerned in this Enquiry.

6. That it is certainly more difficult in the Case of *Revolters*, than of such who have had their *Education* in the *Roman Communion*.

These things I conceive sufficient to shew that our acknowledgment in this affair can afford no security for a *Revolt*, to a Person who seriously believes Us, and is desirous to be Guided by Us. But if we be considered as *Adversaries*, and consequently our Authority be considered only as cogent against our Selves, especially when taken in conjunction with other things, as they usually argue the Security of a change from our *Singularity* in Asserting the
Salva-

Salvability of our own Communion, and our *Agreement* even with the *Romanists* in owning the Salvability of theirs; whence they conclude it safer for an *Ignorant Person* to venture her Practice in that way, in the safety whereof we are all *agreed*, than in that wherein we are *singular*: In Answer hereunto I shall, at present, only propose these things to the Gentlewomans Consideration:

1. That the unreasonableness of this Argument has been sufficiently shown by others; particularly She may consult Bishop *Taylor's* Letter, and the Dean of *Canterbury's* Sermon, which are in *English*, and are short and easie to be understood by her.

On 1 Cor.
HL. 15

2. That

2. That the Supposition it self is false here. For they of the *Roman* Communion do as fully own the Possibility of the Salvation of particular Persons in our Communion, as we do in theirs, both as to the Principles whence it is deduced, (touching *Invin- cible Ignorance*) which are granted as well by them as by Us, and even in express Confessions, when they are pleased to speak their minds freely; of which I must needs say, they are in Policy more cautious, for fear of giving Us any encouragement to continue in our own Communion. If She doubt of this, She may, if She please, consult of our *English* Authors (for in dealing with her I would not willingly quote any others) Mr. *Richworth* Dialog. 1.
 §. 7.

§. 7. pag. 38. Ed. *Paris*. 1648.
 Mr. *Crissy* Exomolog. Sect. 2. Ch.
 50. §. 11. pag. 396. *Knot* in
Charity Maintained, Part I. Chap.
 1. §. 3, 4. compared with Mr.
Chillingworths Answ. ib. §. 3, 4.

3. That this *Candor* of ours,
 when compared with their *re-
 servedness* in speaking their minds
 in this Case, is an Argument of
 our *Ingenuity* and *fair dealing* more
 than theirs, which is a considera-
 ble Argument of trust to an *Igno-
 rant Person*, who finds her self
 obliged to trust the Authority of
 one of Us.

Q. 2. *Whether they be Idolaters, or No?*

I Must confess that I think the true Notion of *Idolatry* more difficult than is commonly conceived, and to my Understanding not yet sufficiently explained. Nor am I willing on this occasion to engage on that Dispute, both because it would be too tedious, and because I think most of the mistakes already entertained concerning it to have been occasioned by its having been stated in *Disputes* with a design on some *particular Adversaries*. Not intending therefore to determine *positively*, Whether the *practices required* by their Church as *Conditions*

ditions of her Communion be necessarily idolatrous? I shall only, at present, recommend these things to a Person in the Gentle-womans Condition, whom I suppose not so capable of examining the particular *merit of the Cause*, and therefore it will be the most Prudent course for such a one to Judge by general Presumptions.

1. That their Notions concerning the *Saints* are exactly the same with those of the later *Heathens* of the Primitive times concerning their *Demons* then worshipped; who yet were as certainly guilty of *Idolatry* (if the concurrent sense of *Primitive Christianity* may be believed) as those accused of it in the Old Testament, concerning whose sense
we

we want those Records which might so fully inform us. For it might have easily been shewn, that those *Demons* were confessed to be of an inferior Order, and not to require that supreme degree of Worship proper to the *Supreme Being*; nay, that they thought them deputed by the *Supreme Being* it self to convey his influences to *Us*, and our Prayers to *Him*.

2. That if the *Heathens* (notwithstanding that their Devotions were designed for good *Demons*) were yet deluded by *Evil ones*, who were by God permitted to interpose in their stead, because they paid that *Relative respect* to Persons whom he had not declared it his pleasure to have so worshipped, and before *Images* where
they

they had no security from any promise of God, that none but *good Demons* should presentiate themselves; How can the *Romanists* be secure that they are not the same way deluded, seeing they have as little Security from God's Word (which is the only competent means from whence they can in this Case have *Security*) that it is his pleasure that they should be *publicly Invoked*, and that he has given them the Office conveying his Blessings to Us, and our Prayers to Him, and that he will permit none but *good Spirits* to presentiate themselves at their *Images*?

3. That if *Miracles* pretended to be done at such *Invocations* be urged as Arguments that God is pleased with them, this was pretended

pretended by the *Heathens* too. And it may be, if it were impartially Enquired into, there would not be *greater and better attested Miracles* for *Invocation of Saints* among the *Romanists*, than for the *Invocation of Demons* among the *Pagans*.

4. That the same Arguments used by the *Scriptures* and *Primitive Christians* against the *Heathen Idolatries*, are applyed by the *Protestants* to the *Image-worship* among the *Papists* now; and the same Answers given by the *Papists* now, were then also insisted on by the *Pagans*.

5. That as these are very shrew'd Suspensions of the *dangerousness* of this Worship, so this *danger* is ventured on without the least *necessity*; there being

ing undeniable Security from the Primitive Records and Revelations of *Christianity*, that God is pleased to accept such Prayers as are addressed to him through the Intercession of *Christ* alone, so that there can be no necessity of having also recourse unto the *Saints*.

6. That *Image-worship* is not countenanced by as much as any *Venerable Authority* of truly Primitive *Christianity*, and that the Second *Nicane* Council that introduced it, was put to very disingenuous Shifts of *counterfeit Authorities* for it.

7. That whatever may be thought of the Worship designed by the *Roman Church*, yet even *Mr. Thorndike* himself (with whose Authority our Adversaries principally

cipally urge us in this Dispute) does not deny that *Idolatry* is practised by the *Ignorant Persons* of that Communion, which the Gentlewoman may justly fear, lest it should prove her own Case.

8. That the *Roman Church* herself cannot be altogether excused from the *Idolatry* of her *Ignorant Communicants*, seeing she puts unnecessary Scandals in Ignorant Persons way, and is guilty of encouraging their *Ignorance* and *Carelessness* of Judging in matters of Religion.

9. That the *Practice* of that Communion is generally worse and grosser than their *Principles* (as the Gentlewoman may inform her self of, in that impartial account which is given of them by
Sir

Sir Edwyn Sandys in his *Speculum Europa*) which yet is observed and countenanced by their most *Eminent Guides*; so that such as She cannot secure themselves from the danger of it.

10. That the *Romish Church* is by so much the more culpable in this Particular, because She has not been content only to *countenance* and encourage a *Practice* in so great danger of proving *Idolatrous*, so needless in it self, so destitute of all Authority, either of Scripture or the Primitive Catholick Church (which yet does so extremely stand in need of Authority;) but She has also imposed it as a *Condition* of her own *Communion* (which She calls *Catholick*) so that they who are willing to *Believe* and *Practice*
all

(47)

all that was *Believed* and *Practised* in the *Primitive Church*, must now be *Anathematized* and condemned for *Hereticks* for refusing, to *Believe* or *Practise* any more, or to condemn those as *Hereticks* who do refuse it.

Q. 3.

Q. 3. *Where was the Church of England before Luthers time.*

THE design of asking this Question is certainly to make our Confession of *Novelty* (in such Cases wherein our Adversaries presume our *Novelty* so notorious as that we our Selves cannot deny it) an Argument against Us ; yet they themselves are concerned in some Cases to deny its cogency. For even they cannot deny that the deprivation of the *Laitie* of the use of the *Cup* (for Example) has been lately introduced into their Church by a *publick Law*. If therefore it may appear that *our Church* is *Ancient*

sient as to all intents and purposes wherein *Antiquity* may be available, but that the *Church of Rome* is not so; and that in the sense wherein the *Church of England* has begun since *Luther*, there is no reason to expect that She should have been *Antienter*, and that the *Justice* of her *Cause* does not require it; and that the *Antiquity* upon these Suppositions confessedly allowed to the *Church of Rome* is no Argument for the *Justice* of her *Cause*: these things, I think, will contain a fully satisfactory Answer to the Gentlewomans Question. I shall not at present engage on an accurate Discussion of these Heads: but shall only suggest such short Observations as may let her see how unreasonable our Adversaries

D

con-

confidence is in this Argument, wherein they do so usually triumph. Therefore

1. *Antiquity* is indeed necessary to be pleaded for *Doctrines*, such especially as are pretended to belong to the *Catholick Faith*, and which are urged as *Conditions of Communion*. This is the Case wherein it is urged by *Tertullian* and *Vincentius Lirinensis* in their very rational Discourses on this Argument. And for this, I think, we may challenge the *Church of Rome* her self to instance in one *positive Doctrine* imposed by us which She her self thinks not *Ancient*. I am sure the Controversie is so stated commonly, that we are blamed, not for Believing any thing *antient* or *necessary* which is not, but, for not believing some things

things which She believes to be so. And if She her self believe all our *Positives*, and withal believes that nothing is so to be believed but what is *Antient*; it will clearly follow that She cannot, in consistency with her own interests, deny the *Antiquity* of our *Positive Doctrines*. But for the other *Doctrines superadded* by them, and denied by us, which are indeed the true occasion of the present Divisions of Communion, we charge them with *Innovation*, and are very confident that they will never be able to prove them, to the satisfaction of any Impartial Person, either from clear Scripture, or from *genuine Antiquity* of the *first* and *purest Ages*, which are the way wherein we are willing to undertake the

proof of our *positive Doctrines*. Nay, their greatest Champions decline the tryal, and complain of the defectiveness and obscurity of the Primitive Christian Writers, which they would not have reason to do if they thought them clear on their side.

These things therefore being thus supposed, *That no Doctrines ought to be imposed but what are Ancient; That ours are so by our Adversaries own Confession, and that our Adversaries Doctrines are not so; and that in Judging this, the private Judgments of particular Persons are to be trusted, as the measures of their own private Practice* (as it is plain that those Discourses of *Tertullian* and *Vincentius Livinensis* are principally designed for the satisfaction of
of

of particular Persons, which had been impertinent if the Church's Judgment had been thought Credible in her own Case, as a Judge of Controversies; besides that even now this Argument from Antiquity is made use of for convincing such as are supposed unsatisfied with her Authority; and therefore to whom that Authority can be no Argument) which Liberty of private Judgment is then especially most fit to be indulged when the distance is so remote as it is now, when no Church has now these Advantages for conveying down Apostolical Tradition in a Historical way as She had then: These things, I say, being thus supposed, it will follow that we are wrongfully Excommunicated, and therefore that we have no

reason to fear that their Censures should be confirmed by God. And though I confess every Error in the Cause of the Churches Censures will not excuse the *Censured Person* for continuing out of her Communion, when the Communion may be recovered by any *Submission*, how *inconvenient* and *loss* soever, if it be not *sinful*; yet that is the very Case here, that we are not only *wrongfully* Excommunicated, but the terms proposed for our restitution to Communion would be *directly sinful*, as has been *vid. Q. I. §. I.* shewn before. Whence it will follow that we are *excusable*, not only in suffering our Selves to be *cast out* of their Communion, but also in *continuing* out of it. But because this is not
our

our whole Case, who do not only *abstain* from their Communion, but *set up* a Communion of our own, and maintain an *Ecclesiastical Body Politick* distinct from theirs; our defence herein will depend on the *Justice* of the *Ecclesiastical power* of those Persons who govern our *Ecclesiastical Assemblies*. And therefore

2. All our concernment for *Antiquity* here will be, that our *Bishops* derived their power from such as derived theirs with a power of communicating it in a *continual Succession* from the *Apostles*. And this we do acknowledge true concerning the *Papish Bishops* themselves, and do derive the validity of our Orders from the *Antiquity* of theirs without any more prejudice to our

Cause than the *Primitive Catho-*
licks did suffer by acknowledg-
 ing the *validity of Baptism* admi-
 nistred by *Hereticks*. For the
Succession of their *Pastors* is very
 reconcilable with a supposed *In-*
novation in their *Doctrines* (and
 certainly themselves cannot deny
 that it is so, whilst they charge
 the *Orientals* with *Heresie*, whom
 yet they cannot deny to have al-
 waies maintained as uninterupted
 a *Succession* of *Bishops* as them-
 selves) especially considering
 that the *Innovations* we charge
 them with , of *adding false* and
new Articles of Faith ; not of
denying the *old* ones, do not in
 the least *interrupt* or *invalidate*
 their *Succession*. This therefore
 being supposed , that the first
Bishops of our *English Reforma-*
tion

tion received their power from such as had derived theirs by an uninterrupted succession from the *Apostles* ; it will follow that they were *valid Bishops*, and if so, had the power of keeping *Church-Assemblies*, and exercising *Jurisdiction* in them, both for the Government of their present Charges, and communicating their power to succeeding Generations. For nothing of this is pretended to exceed the power of a *valid Bishop*. The charge of *Heresy* it self cannot hinder the *validity* of their *Orders* either *received* or *communicated* ; though it may indeed, in the Judgment of them who believe them so, render them obnoxious to *Canonical Incapacities* of executing them, and to *Legal Degradations*, not from the

D 5 Character,

Character, but from the *actual Jurisdiction* properly belonging to their Office. But to such *Canonical Incapacities* and *Degradations*, they will not deny even *validly-Ordained* Persons themselves to be obnoxious, and therefore cannot make that an Argument against the *validity* of our *Orders*. And yet when this Charge of *Heresy* against our *Bishops* is not here to be Judged by the *pretences* of our *Adversaries*, but by the *merit* of the Cause; and therefore is not to be taken for granted till it be proved.

That therefore which is indeed new in the *Church of England*, is, That though her *Positive Doctrines* and *Orders* be *Ancient*, yet the *Profession* of her *Negatives*, and the *open Assertion* of her

her *Liberty* from the Encroachments of the *Roman Court*, and all her other *Practices* grounded on these *Principles*, were not avowed by her Ecclesiastical Governors for several Centuries before the *Reformation*. And in Answer hereunto I shall insist on the heads already intimated. Therefore

1. There was no reason to expect that her opposition to these Errors should have been *Ancienter*, though we should suppose the Errors themselves to have been so. For there was no reason to expect that Errors should have been discovered for some Ages before the *Reformation*, when there was so great a want of that kind of *Grammatical and Historical Learning* which is only fit to qualify a Person to Judge of *Ecclesiastical Traditions*.

Tradition; at least, they were not likely to have been discovered by such a number as had been requisite to maintain an open opposition. And if the Errors had been discovered, yet it was not easie to expect success in holding out against the *Court of Rome*, which was then so very powerful, and there was no reason to expect such attempts from *Prudent Persons* where there was no probability of success. And there was yet least reason of all to expect this opposition from *Bish:ps* then, when no *Bishops* were made without the *Popes* consent, which he was not likely to give to such as were likely to oppose him; when, after they were made, they were obliged to be true to Him by express *Oaths*, as well as by their

their *Interests* of peaceable continuance, or hopes of future preferment; when, at least, it was impossible to resist their *Fellow-Bishops*, the generality of whom were, in all likelihood, swayed by these Prejudices; when they had seen mighty *Princes* themselves worsted in those Contests, and the extreme Severity of that Court against Dissenters; when, lastly, differing from the *Church of Rome* in any thing was counted *Heresy*, and *Heresy* was prosecuted with the extremest *Infamy* (which must needs weaken the Authority of those Opposers with others) as well as other Penalties of the *Canon-Law*. Nor

2. Does the *Justice* of our Cause require a greater *Antiquity* for our *Negatives*: For,

1. Our

1. Our *Negatives* are not pretended to be of perpetual obligation, but only for preventing the malignity of the contrary *Affirmative Articles* to which they are opposed. And therefore there is no reason to expect *Formal Negatives* opposed to *Additional Articles* from the beginning, before the *Additional Articles* themselves were thought of; nor to expect a *Reformation* of *Abuses* before there were *Abuses* to be *Reformed*, seeing that in course of Nature these *Negatives* presuppose the contrary *Affirmatives*, as a pretence of *Reformation* must also presuppose *Abuses*. And therefore the
pretence

pretence of the greater *Antiquity* of our Adversaries *Errors* and *Abuses* is so far from prejudicing the reputation of our *Negatives* and *Reformation*, as that it is indeed the best Argument of their *Justice* and *Seasonableness*. For such *Negatives* as these, and such a *Reformation*, must needs have been unwarrantable, if there had not been before *Errors* fit to be denied, and *Abuses* fit to be reformed. Nor

2. Is it any Prejudice to the *Justice* of our *Cause*, that these *Errors* were not opposed with *formal Negatives* as soon as they appeared. For such *Errors*

as these were usually first received as the Opinions of *private Persons* before they were countenanced by *Authority*, and whilst they proceeded no further, there was not that mischief in them, nor consequently that obligation to oppose them, as when at length they came to be so countenanced. For the Errors of *Private Persons*, whilst they are no more, are not conceived so to oblige us to be of their mind, as that our *silence* should in any Prudence be expounded as an *Argument* of our *consent*; and consequently cannot be such a provocation to us to oppose them openly in our own Defence. Nor 3. Is

3. Is it necessary to expect that there should have been an open opposition of them, even as soon as countenanced by *Authority*. For if, even in the reproof of the miscarriages of *private Persons*, Christianity obliges us to proceed with all possible *candor* and *modesty*; we are certainly much rather obliged to proceed so in dealing with Persons of *Authority*. We should give them time to reflect, and we should bear with any Personal inconveniences that are not directly sinful; rather than occasion those disturbances which are usually to be expected from a publick opposition of them.

them. Nor is this forbearance more agreeable to *reason*, than to the *sentiments* of those Ages who were generally possessed with an excessive veneration for *Authority*, especially *Ecclesiastical*; so that there is reason to believe that they would bear with such *Errors* as long as the *Abuses* were tolerable, however otherwise *inconvenient*.

4. Therefore that which makes these *Errors intolerable* to *private Persons* in dealing with *Authority* (for of such I speak) is the *imposing* and *urging* them as *Conditions* of *Communion*. And this might have been shewn to have been late, not before their *Errors* were

were *defined* and *imposed* in their *Councils*. And therefore it was but lately that any publick opposition was to be expected, even from them who were in their Consciences perswaded that our Adversaries Doctrines were *Erroneous*. And

5. When they were thus *imposed*, yet even then *private Persons* were concerned, in *Conscience* as well as *Prudence*, to forbear an open opposition, when there were no hopes of *doing good*, nay too probable fears of prejudicing their Cause by it for the future: when upon their opposition, they must have expected to have been *condemned*; when being

ing condemned, they were to be cast out of *Communion* ; when being Excommunicated for such a Cause, others would have been *deterred* by their Example, and their *credit* must have been impaired by the *Infamy* incurred by the *Canon-Law* then in force, and their very *condemnation* would for the future mightily prejudice Mens minds against the like attempts, when none could revive the like true Doctrine without the dis-repute of being supposed to revive an anciently-condemned *Heresy* ; and when there were no hopes of being able to preserve themselves in *opposite Assemblies*

blies without *Bishops* to Head them, without whom they could not maintain a *Succeſſion* of *Prieſts*, nor conſequently of *Sacraments*, and the like employments and advantages of *Eccleſiaſtical Aſſemblies*; and when no *Bishops* were likely to countenance ſuch a deſign, whiſt they were held in ſuch captivity to the *Court of Rome* by Oaths as well as their other *Worldly Interests*, and when no *Persons* of a free ingenuous temper were likely to attain the honour of *Episcopacy*.

These Reasons, with a very eaſie Application, may ſuffice to ſhew that in an *ordinary way* there was no reaſon to expect the Reformation

formation sooner than it was. And that there was no necessity sufficient to oblige God to interpose to raise Men up to it *Extraordinarily*, will appear if it be considered

6. That it is not every necessity of the Church that can oblige God to use such *Extraordinary means*, but only such a necessity as must have destroyed a Church *from the Earth*, that is, such a Society of Men wherein Salvation might be attained by the *ordinary Prescriptions* of the Gospel. Now the prevalency of these *Errors* does not oblige us to acknowledge that such a Church as this must have failed even in those *Ages* wherein
wherein

wherein these *Errors* are supposed to have prevailed for some Centuries before the *Reformation*: For

1. Though the *Occidental Church* had failed, yet *Christ* might have had such a *Church* among the several Communion of the *Ori-entals*. And I know no greater inconvenience, in this regard, in admitting the failure of the *Occidental Church*, than what our Adversaries themselves are obnoxious to, in admitting the like defection in the *Oriental*.
2. The prevailing of these Errors does not oblige us to deny an *ordinary possibility* of *Salvation* according
to

to the Prescriptions of the Gospel, even in the *Church of Rome* it self in those Centuries before the Reformation: For

1. We do not deny all *Necessaries* to *Salvation*, even according to the *ordinary Prescriptions* of the *Gospel*, to have been taught even then in the *Church of Rome*. The *Errors* we charge them with, are not of *Defect*, but *Adding* to the *Original Articles* of *Faith*. And therefore
2. If it may appear that the sin of *Adding* to the *Faith* was not (to such as were no farther accessory to it than by continuing in the
Communion

Communion of such as were really guilty of it) so imputable *ordinarily* as to hinder the Salvation of such as were not otherwise wanting to themselves in their own Endeavours ; or at least not in such a degree as to oblige God to interpose in an *Extraordinary* way for its *Ordinary* prevention : this will be sufficient to shew that (supposing those *Errors* so dangerous as we do indeed suppose them, yet) God was not obliged to raise up, and maintain a *Communion* in opposition to them for preventing the failing of such a *Church* as I have

E

spoken

spoken of, even in these *Western Parts*. And that this was so, may appear from these Considerations :

1. That that skill in *Ecclesiastical Learning*, by which our first Reformers were enabled to discover these *Errors*, was generally wanting in the Ages before the Reformation, which might make their mistakes then much more pardonable than now.

2. That the great mischief of these *Errors* is, not so much the believing more for matters of Faith than really was so, as the mischievous
Con-

Consequence of doing so, the *Divisions* of the *Church* necessarily following hereupon, the *condemning* of good *Catholicks* for *Hereticks* and *Schismaticks*, and *excluding* them from *Communion*, and hereby making the *peace* of *Christendome* impossible on any just and tolerable terms, and *Abuses* impossible to be *Reformed*. Which was not so imputable in those Ages when there was no *visible Communion* to be condemned by joyning with that of *Rome*; for as for the even unjust *Excommunication* of *particular*

Persons, Providence is not so concerned as to interpose *Extraordinarily* for their prevention. This I say on Supposition that the *Waldenses* and *Albigenses*, &c. were such as our Adversaries represent them. If they were otherwise, then among them there was a *Succession*, for so long, of *Churches* holding our Doctrines before *Luther*.

3. The *Prudential Reasons* now given might then generally excuse *private Persons*, and all such as were not accessory to the guilt of introducing those

those Errors (who were much the *greater Part*; and it is only for the greater Part that Providence is necessarily concerned) from the guilt of not *publicly Reforming* them. Yet even they are not so Excusable now, when the power of the Pope is so much decryed, and there are so many *Churches* and *Church-Governours*, under whose Protection they may put themselves, and with whose Communion they may joyn, in opposition to them.

3. The *Antiquity* allowed to their Errors on this Supposition

E 3 is

is not sufficient to Justifie their Cause. For,

1. This *Antiquity* is not *Primitive*, but only of some later Ignorant Ages. And the Unreasonableness of presuming Doctrines to have been *Primitive* only, because they were actually found embraced by the *Church* in *later Ages*, and of Prescribing on that account against a new Examination of them by immediate recourse to the *Originals*, might have been shewn from the *Fathers* as well as from the *Protestants*.

2. The *Antiquity* of those Notions of theirs, whereby they confine the *Catholick Church* to that part of it in the *Roman Communion* (which might have been proved Fundamental to all their other Doctrines, as they are made
Articles

Articles of Faith and Conditions of Communion) is contradicted by the *Oriental Churches* generally, who are as *ancient*, and of as Unquestionable a *Succession*, as the *Church of Rome* her self, and as *ancient* in teaching the contrary.

3. The utmost *Antiquity* which we allow for their unwarrantable *Doctrines* is not so great as must be acknowledged (by all that will Judge candidly) for several, which on all sides are acknowledged to be *Heretical*, I do not only mean those of the *Arians*, but also of those great *Ecclesies* of the *Oriental Historians* and *Enycchiens*, continuing to this day divided from the *Roman Church*; especially if they be really guilty of those *Heresies* which are charged on them, and they must

by *Romanists* be held guilty of some, for Justifying their own Practice of *condemning* them.

4. Some of their present Decrees (particularly those concerning the admission of the *Apo-cryphal* Books into the *Canon*, and receiving *Unwritten Traditions* with *Equal Reverence* with the *Written Word of God*) I doubt are not more *anciently* imposed, as *Conditions of Catholick Communion*, than the Council of *Trent* it self, which was since *Luther*. And both of these are very considerable, and especially the later is very Fundamental to many of their other Decrees:

Q. 4. *Why all the Reformed Churches are not United in One?*

I Presume the design of this Question is not so much a *Curiosity* to be Informed, either of the *Politick Reasons* which in the Course of *Second Causes* might have an Influence on those Divisions which were occasioned by the *Reformation*; or of those that might move God to permit *Second Causes* to act according to their Natural Inclination, without the Interposition of any *Extraordinary* restraint: but only to lay hold on that Advantage from our acknowledged *Divisions*, which they may seem to afford to the

Prejudice of our common *Cause*. I shall therefore at present on y propose such things to the Gentlewomans Consideration, as may let her understand the weakness of this Argument (how Popular never) when they conclude us either mistaken our Selves, or, at least, unfit to Guide others in the *General Reformation*; because we are not all agreed in all the *Particulars*.

To this purpose it will be at present sufficient to insist on two things: 1. That there is no reason why the *Romanists* should upbraid Us with this Argument, and that it is their Interest, as well as ours, to Answer it: 2. That the Argument it self is of no force as it is used by them against us.

1. *There*

1. *There is no Reason why the Romanists should upbraid Us with this Argument, and they, as well as we, are obliged to Answer it.* For,

1. This very Argument was by the *Primitive Heathens* made use of against *Christianity* in General, as it is now against Us; and our Adversaries would do well to consider, whether the same Answers pleadable by themselves now in behalf of those *Christians*, and actually pleaded by the *Apolo-gists* then, be not as pleadable for Us now. Nay, this multitude of *Seets* in *Christianity* is even now the great Argument of Irreligious Persons against the Truth of *Religion*; and I cannot believe that any Piously disposed Person among them, can be pleased to allow

low the Argument to be of any force in either Case, rather than want an Argument against Us. Yet I believe they will never be able to shew any Disparity.

2. If they speak, not of *Dividing Principles*, but of *actual Divisions*, they, as well as we, have such among themselves. They have *Divisions* betwixt the *Irish Remonstrants* and *Anti-Remonstrants*, *Molinists* and *Jansenists*, as well as *Thomists* and *Scotists*, and *Jesuites*, some of which Parties are Divided as well in *Communion* as in *Opinions*. If they say that these Divisions are not the faults of their Opinions, but the particular perversity of Persons, who will not stick to those *Principles* which might keep them *United*, when their Interest inclines them

them otherwise ; the same will be pretended by every *Dividing Party*. If they think it Injurious that their whole *Communion* should be charged with the misdemeanors of *Persons* condemned by it ; We all of Us plead the same, for there is no Party that does not condemn all others in those things wherein they Divide from themselves.

3. If they think our Differences concerning the *Particulars* we would have *Reformed*, an Argument that the whole design of a *Reformation* is in it self Suspicious and Uncertain ; let them consider what themselves do or can say, when they are, in the like way of Arguing, urged by Us with the several Opinions concerning the *Seat of Infallibility* ;
whence

whence our Authors conclude the Uncertainty of the thing it self. It might easily have been shewn, upon this and the like Occasions, how they do, and are obliged to, acknowledge the Unreasonableness of this way of Arguing. But the designed Brevity of my present Employment only permits me to point at the Heads of what might be said, not to enlarge on the Particulars.

4. It might have been shewn that these Differences among them concerning the Judge of Controversies, tend *Naturally*, and by due *Rational Consequence*, to the dissolution of their *Communion*, a Charge which we think cannot be proved against that which we believe the Right Communion.

2. There-

2. Therefore, to shew directly
the weakness of this Argument,
Let it be considered

1. That whatever Differences
they upbraid us with, yet they can
never prove that they follow by
any *Natural* and *Rational* Consequence
from the General Principles
of the *Reformation*, though possibly
they may indeed have been
occasioned by that Liberty of Spirit
which was absolutely requisite
for undertaking a design of such a
Nature; as it must on all sides be
acknowledged possible that things
really good may notwithstanding
prove occasions of Evil. And how
very Unjust and Unreasonable it
is to charge *Personal Faults* upon
Designs (that is in this Case the
faults of *Reformers* upon the *Reformation*)
all, even the *Romanists* them-

themselves, will acknowledge, in Cases wherein they are dis-interested.

2. That, this being Supposed, all that they can conclude from these *Divisions* of the *Reformers*, is only, that no one *Communion* of the *Reformers* has that advantage over the rest as that, Antecedently to all Enquiry into the merit of the Cause, its Word is fit to be trusted as a Guide in Controversies, to assure any of its own Truth, and of the Error of all differing from it. This, if the Gentlewoman will observe, She will find that their Arguments from this and the like Topicks, only aim at. For because they challenge such a Priviledge themselves, they fancy Us to do so to; and that our design is not to overthrow a Judge of Controversies,

sies, but only to *translate* that Title from the *Pope* to *Luther*, or some others of our eminent *Reformers*, which is far from our design. But this *difference* in *Opinion* does not in the least prove, but that, upon a particular Enquiry into the merit of the Cause, one Party may be found to have the advantage of the other, which is all that we pretend to.

3. That this *difference* of the several Parties of the Reformation in other things, is rather a very strong *Presumption* (for an Ignorant Person who must conduct herself by *Presumptions*) that there is great reason for those things wherein they are all *agreed*, and indeed is a greater Argument for the Credibility of the *Reformation* in general, than for that of the *Roman*

Com.

Communion. For to a dis-inter-
 ested Person the Agreement of
 those is a more valuable Argument
 for the Truth of what they say,
 who seem most of all acted by the
merit of the things, and least of all
 influenced by the *Opinions* and
Authorities of a few; and there can
 hardly be conceived a more con-
 siderable Argument of their *free-*
dom in *Judgment*, than their *actual*
difference in other things. What
 therefore the *Protestants* are a-
 greed in, seems more likely to be
 the real sense of all that are so a-
 greed upon an Impartial Enqui-
 ry; whereas the *Romanists* are ge-
 nerally Influenced by a few of the
Court of Rome, to whom the rest
 do generally conceive themselves
 obliged in Conscience to con-
 form, And this advantage of the
differences

differences of *Protestants* for recommending their *Credibility* in other things, above that of their *Adversaries*, to the Trust of an *Ignorant Person*, will appear the more remarkable, if it be considered

4. That they are not only agreed in *general* in the *fitness* of a *Reformation*, but also in most of the *Particulars* to be *Reformed*. Indeed if they were only agreed in *general*, that it were fit a *Reformation* should be, but agreed in no *Particulars*; it might seem too probable a Suspicion, that it was not *Truth*, but *Faction*, and the disturbance of the *Publick*, that was their common design. But that is far from being the Case here.

5. The *Divisions* of the *Protestants* in *Doctrine* are not so irrecon-

concileable as they may seem. The *Harmony of Confessions* shew them agreed in the *Principal*. As for the others, it is plain that our *Church of England* does not think them worth contending for, whilst She admits the several Parties into her Communion ; and if other *Protestants* think otherwise, yet She is not Responsible for them, because She is not of their mind. The most pernicious Principles of all, which most Naturally tend to *Division*, and which make the differences resulting from them most impossible to be reconciled, are the differences concerning *Church Government* ; and in that our *Church* has Innovated nothing that should cause any breach, even from the *Roman*, much less from any other part of the *Catholic*

lick Church. And most of their other *Differences* are no longer Irreconcilable than the *Persons* are likely to continue averse to *Reconciliation*; but these *Differences* about *Church-Government* are so derived from the *nature* of the *Things*, as that they may Cause Division among Persons otherwise well-meaning, and of a Peaceable Disposition.

6. This Argument from the *Divisions* of *Protestants*, is principally proper for such as are not actually engaged in any *particular Communion* of them, and even to them ought to have no more force than that of a *Prudent Presumption*, till the Person so Presuming might have leasure to examine Particulars. But that seems not to be the Gentlewoman's Case
whom

whom I suppose to have been hitherto educated in the *Church of England*, and to have had sufficient opportunities of Informing her self concerning us. For such a one it would sure be sufficient that *our Church* is no way guilty of these *Divisions*, whatsoever may be the Case of other *Protestants*.

Q.5. *Why the Church of England doth not hold up to Confession, Fasting-days, Holy Oyl, which we our Selves commend?*

IT is a mistake that the *Questionist* does suppose Us to commend *Holy Oyl*.

However we think all the Instances

stances here mentioned *lawful* and *indifferent*, and so to be as obnoxious to the *Prudence* of particular *Church-Governors*, as other things of that nature are by all acknowledged to be ; and we shall conceive our Selves secure of the Gentlewomans Communion, if She will not alter till our Adversaries prove them necessary Antecedently to *Church Authority*, which is more than they will as much as pretend to, at least, concerning some of them.

These things therefore being thus supposed, I shall propose two things to the Gentlewomans Consideration : 1. That supposing We were to blame in omitting them, yet this were no ground for Her to leave our Communion : 2. That as far as they are not imposed

posed by our Church, there was reason for their not imposing them.

1. *Supposing that we were indeed to blame in omitting these Ecclesiastical Observances, yet this would be no sufficient ground to excuse the Gentlewoman for leaving our Communion. For*

1. *No Indifferent thing, how imprudent or inexpedient soever (and that is the highest Charge that the Churches mistake in a matter of this nature, is chargeable withal, as long as the Object is supposed of its own nature Indifferent) as long as it is not sinful (and certainly it can be no Sin to submit for Peace's sake to an imprudent Constitution) can excuse*

cuse a departure from a Communion that is in other regards allowable.

2. Whatever a Separation on this account might be in others, yet it is less excusable in *Subjects*, who are no way Responsible for as much as the *Imprudences* of such Constitutions, and who are certainly bound to *bear* with all tolerable frailties of their lawful Governours, and who are not indeed so well qualified for Judging concerning them, as neither being so well skilled in Politicks generally, nor being made acquainted with the secret Reasons of such Constitutions, which might make that, which without them might seem strange, appear highly commendable when considered with them

F

3. The

3. The Gentlewomans Sex, and possibly her particular Condition, may not have those Advantages which many others (though Subjects also) have for Judging concerning them.

These Arguments are so agreeable to the Principles of our Adversaries themselves, as that they frequently make use of them for retaining Persons in their own Communion. Which the Gentlewoman may be pleased to take notice of, if any of her Tempters should Question them here, where they are disserviceable to their Interests. But farther

4. *Abuses in Governments* acknowledging themselves *Fallible* (though they be supposed indeed to be *Abuses*) are much more tolerable than in those who do not; seeing

seeing there may be hopes that Governours, acknowledging themselves *Fallible*, may in time be better informed, and may then themselves *reform* what is amiss, without the compulsion of their Subjects; which can never be expected from such as pretend to be *Infallible*.

5. If *Abuses* of this Nature be conceived a sufficient Reason for leaving a Communion wherein we are already, much more are they sufficient for hindring our access to another, wherein as yet we are not. So that this same Reason, if it should make her desert the Communion of the *Church of England*, would also hinder her joyning in that of *Rome*, in which the most Judicious and Candid Persons of that Communion will

acknowledge *Abuses* of the like nature.

2. *As far as these Omissions are countenanced by our Church, there is reason for it.*

I say [*as far as they are countenanced by our Church*] and therefore the reason I shall give for such Omissions shall be as they are considered under that Notion.

1. Therefore, for *Fasting Days*, I think they are imposed with the same design of *Religion* in our Church as in that of *Rome* (for that account of *Jejunium Cecilianum*, which is given by some, is not taken for the true sense of our Church by her most genuine Sons) and that our Church is conceived to have as much Authority to oblige her Subjects in Impositions

sitions of that Nature, so that I cannot look on this disuse prevailing in *Practice* as countenanced by our Church. If the Gentlewoman be so zealously concerned for them, I am sure She may Practice them in our Communion, as well as in that of *Rome*, as several others do.

2. *Confession*, even to a *Priest*, in order to his *Advice* and *Absolution*, our Church, I think, owns as much as that of *Rome*; though we do not make it a *Sacrament*; nor make it *absolutely necessary*, in an *ordinary way*, for the remission of every *particular Sin*, that it be *particularly confessed*. That the *Practice* of it is at present discontinued, our Church, I think, is not the Cause. That She has not interposed her Authority to con-

tinue it, might have been excused :

1. Because the thing is only of *Ecclesiastical Right*. For the ancientest obligation to confess Sins, though *scandalous* in their *own nature*, yet not become *notorious* (though that differed much from the Confession which is now used in the *Roman Church*) was first introduced after the Persecution by *Decius*, and that in opposition to the *Novatians*, as *Socrates* affirms ; and this was also afterwards taken away by *Nectarius* Bishop of *Constantinople*, who ordered every one to be left to his *own Conscience* in that matter, for which other Bishops were so far from censuring him,

him, that they followed him in it almost in all places, as the same Historian tells us, and that omission was vehemently pleaded for by St. *Chrysostome*, and obtained for no small time in the *Greek Church*, whatsoever it did in other places. Whence it follows that She has power, in discretion, to determine concerning its *actual practice* what She thinks fit.

2. Farther, this being supposed, that it was in our Churches power not to *impose* it, that She did act *prudently* in not *imposing* it, but rather *recommending* it to the Liberty of *private Devotions*, will appear, if it be considered that, if She had

imposed it, She must necessarily have excluded all such from her Communion as had not been satisfied with it; and it had not been Prudent to have excluded Persons from her Communion for *Indifferent things* avoidable by her, when She was complaining of the like Tyranny in the *Church of Rome*, especially considering that it was also likely that the number was great of those who were so dissatisfied with it.

However, if the Gentlewoman be desirous to *Practise* it for her own Edification, I believe She may be furnished with Persons fitted for it in the *Church of England*.

3. As for the use of *Holy Oyl* in any of the pretended *Sacraments*, we do not so far condemn it, as to refuse Communion with other Churches that use it; nay, we our Selves retain it as a decent Ceremony of *Consecration* in the *Coronations* of our *Princes*. Only we again conceive it

1. A matter *indifferent* in it self, and not Essential to those Offices, because of the differences in the Church concerning it.
2. This being supposed, our *Church* does no way conceive it *Prudent* to continue it: both because it was the design of the *Reformation* to reduce the *Sacraments* to their *Primitive Simplicity*, that so Persons might Con-

Communicate in them on the same free terms as then; and because the Errors of those who made them *Essential* to the *Mysteries*, were of great Consequence, and very fit to be so discountenanced by a discontinuance of the *Practice* it self.

If by the *Holy Oyl* here mentioned, be meant particularly their *Sacrament of Extreme Unction*, i. Our Adversaries cannot prove a *Sacramental Unction* for the first Centuries. A *Miraculous* one they may, but seeing themselves confess the ordinary Use of the *Miracle* to have ceased, there is no necessary reason obliging our *Church* to continue the *external Ceremony*. This is at least sufficient to shew that it is in the
Churches

Churches power to continue it, or not. Which being supposed, I add, 2. That even in regard of the *benefit* expected by it, whether of *Bodily recovery*, or *remission of sins*, or *Spiritual strength* against the *Agony of Death*, the *Gentlewoman*, nor any other Subject of *our Church*, can suffer no loss by our Church's discontinuance of it. For all these things are as certainly attainable by the means continued in our Church from Unquestionable *Apostolical Tradition* (as the *Prayers* and *Absolution* of the *Priest* and the *blessed Sacrament*) as they could by the *Unction* it self; so that I cannot perceive how a devout Person need to be concerned for the want of it, on the terms now mentioned. Especially considering 3, That in the way

way it is Administred among them, to Persons past hopes of recovery, and usually past sense of their own condition, it cannot be conceived in any rational way, capable of Edifying the *Devotion* of the Person concerned, and no other way is suitable to the Dispensation of the *Gospel*. And supposing it no *Sacrament*, there is no reason imaginable why the Prayers of the Assistants for such a Person may not be as acceptable to God, without the observation of this external Ceremony, as with it. And as upon these concessions its Continuance must needs appear unnecessary, so 4. It would be inexpedient to countenance the Errors consequent to the Opinion of its being a *Sacrament*, which are of so weighty

weighty a concernment, by continuance of a Custom which may so easily be spared. These things may suffice at present for satisfying the Gentlewoman of her little concernment for it, without engaging on the Dispute concerning its lawfulness.

Now this Fundamental Principle of our Churches Proceedings in these and the like Particulars, concerning the power of the Church for *Innovating* from *Ancient Customs*, not only by *Adding* new ones, but *Abrogating* old ones, might have been proved not only from the *Principles*, but from several *Practices* of the *Roman Church* her self.

Q. 6. *Why was Reformation done by Act of Parliament?*

R *E*formation may be considered two ways: Either

1. *As preached and imposed under pain of Spiritual Censures, and of Exclusion from the Communion of the Church, and a deprivation of all the Priviledges consequent to that Communion. And this is certainly the Right of the Church, and was accordingly practised by the Church in our English Reformation:*

2. *As Enacted as a Law of the*

the *Land*, and consequently as urged the same way as other *Laws* are, under *temporal Penalties* and *external Coercion*, and encouraged by *temporal Advantages*. And this is undoubtedly the Right of the *Secular power*. And this was all in which the *Secular power* did concern it self in the *Reformation*.

What I can further foresee in favour of our Adversaries is, that
 1. The *Secular Power* ought in *Conscience* to be herein advised by the *Ecclesiasticks*: and 2. That though *external obedience* may be paid to the mistaken Decrees of the *Secular power* following the mistaken part of the *Ecclesiasticks*, yet the Obligation (in *Conscience* and *Right*) of such Decrees must be derived from the *Justice* of the
 Churches

Churches proceedings in advising the *Magistrate* ; so that no Act of the *Magistrate* can make amends for any essential defect in the proceedings of the *Church*. But the only Effect of the Magistrates concurrence in that Case is, that what is already performed without *Heresy* or *Schism* in the *Church*, may be by that means settled in such a particular *Commonwealth* without *Schism* or *Sedition* in the *State*. And therefore seeing they suppose that at the *Reformation* the greater number of the *Bishops* then being, were overawed and deprived of the Liberty of their Votes by the *Secular Magistrate* , and it is the nature of all Societies to be swayed by the greater Part ; therefore they
 way

may think it unreasonable to ascribe the *Reformation* to the *Church of England*, but only to a *Schismatical part* of it; so that the *Magistrate* having attempted this *Reformation* without warrant from the *Church*, they think they do well to call our *Reformation* it self *Parliamentary*.

To this therefore I Reply,

1. That the use we make of this Topick of the *Magistrates* concurrence, is indeed no other than to clear our *Reformation* from being *Seditious*, which is ordinarily charged on Us by our *Adversaries*, and much more ordinarily on the *forreign Protestants*.

2. That

2. That for clearing the very proceedings of the *Magistracy* from being *Heretical* or *Schismatical*, to the Conscience of the *Magistracy* it self, it is sufficient that the *Magistracy* gave its *Assistance* and *Protection* to no other *Church*, but such as, at least, according to the genuine Dictate of their Conscience, was neither *Heretical* nor *Schismatical*. But this Justification of the *private Conscience* of the *Magistracy* is, I confess, a thing we are at present not so necessarily concerned for; and therefore

3. We grant farther, that for satisfying our own Consciences of the *Justice* of these proceedings of the *Magistracy*, it is requisite that we be satisfied that they were Advised by that part
of

of the *Clergy*, whose *Advice* we conceive they ought to have followed. So that if this may appear in the Case we are speaking of, this, and this alone, will be a sufficient Vindication of the *Magistrates* proceedings to the Consciences of its *Subjects*.

4. Therefore the Determination of the *Justice* of the *Advice* followed by the *Magistrate*, may be resolved two wayes: Either from the *merit* of the *Cause*; or from the *Legal Authority* and *Right* the *Persons* may be presumed to have to be consulted on such occasions. As for the former, it is in the present Case the principal Dispute, Whether the *Reformation* undertaken by the *Magistrate*, was right or not? and therefore very unfit to be relied

lyed on as a *Presumption* to prove the *Magistrates* proceedings Irregular. The later therefore only is proper to be insisted on here. And it consists of two charges: That by the *Laws* of the *Land* the *Magistrate* ought to have been advised by the *Bishops* then possessed of the several Sees; and That in advising with the *Clergy*, - whoever they were, he ought to have allowed them the Liberty of speaking their minds, and to have been swayed by the greater part. These things are conceived so necessary, as that the *Magistrate* not observing them, may be presumed to act as no way influenced by the *Clergy*. Which is the Reason why they call our *Reformation*, wherein they suppose them not observed, *Parliamentary*.

1. There-

1. Therefore *as to the Legal Right of the Popish Clergy to advise the Secular Magistrate*, two things may be Replied:

1. That this *Legal Right* may be forfeited by the Persons by their Personal misdemeanors, and of this forfeiture the *Secular Magistrate* himself is the *proper judge*; and that this was exactly the *Popish Bishops Case* at that time.

2. That the consideration of this *Legal Right* is of no use for satisfying the *Consciences* of their *Subjects*, which yet is the *only use* that is seasonable for this occasion.

2. *As for the Canonical freedom to be allowed them in advising, and the obli-*

obligation of the Magistrate to follow the advice of the greater part : These Canonical Rights can only satisfy the Consciences of their own Communion, but cannot be pretended necessary to be observed, where there are different Communions. For

1. The Romanists themselves never allow that freedom to Persons out of their Communion, as was plain in the Council of Trent, and still appears on all occasions.

2. Especially in particular National Churches, as ours was, they themselves will not deny that the greater part may prove Heretical, and therefore likely to prevail by Plurality of Votes ;
in

in which Case themselves would notwithstanding think it unequal for the *Magistrate* to be swayed by them.

3. This has alwaies been the *Practice* of the *Church*, and the *Catholick Emperors*, never to allow any *Canonical Right* to the Assemblies and Censures of *Hereticks*, as *Athanasius* was restored first by *Maximinus* Bishop of *Triers*, then by Pope *Julius*, after that by *Maximus* Bishop of *Jerusalem*, and at last by the Emperour *Jovinian*, without any *Canonical* revocation of the Synods that had condemned him. Many Instances of the like Nature might be given.

4. The

4. The *Popish Clergy* had given the first Precedent of this Liberty themselves, in refusing to admit of the *Canonical Appeal* of the *Protestants* from the *Pope* to a *free General Council*.

FINIS.

